UFI
262
Wri/Eas
55029

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
TOWN HALL, BOMBAY-400 023.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 27 February, 2016

EARLY CHRISTIANITY

IN

ARABIA;

A HISTORICAL ESSAY.

55029

BY

THOMAS WRIGHT, Esq., M.A., F.S.A.,

HON. M.R.S.L., &c.

CORRESPONDING MEMBER OF THE IMPERIAL INSTITUTE OF FRANCE

(ACADÉMIE DES INSCRIPTIONS ET BELLES-LETTRES.)

LONDON:

BERNARD QUARITCH, 16, CASTLE STREET,

LEICESTER SQUARE.

MDCCCLV.

ORI
260
wri/Ear
55029

PREFACE.

When the following pages were written, the author, who was then very young, pursued with at least considerable zeal the study of the Oriental languages and literature, a study which, upon his entering the university, he laid aside, not again to be resumed. The historical essay now published was written in the belief that the events which it relates had received but little attention in this country, and had never been presented in a popular form to English readers; and at the same time he thought, as he is still inclined to think, that they form an interesting episode in the history of mankind, and that they are a necessary introduction to our knowledge of the origin of that religion which has exercised so mighty an influence on the whole world during the middle ages. He had preserved the manuscript without any determinate idea of publishing it, until the general interest in the affairs of the East which has been revived by the great events that are now taking place has led him to believe that his sketch of the

history of Christianity in Arabia before it was subverted by the arms of Muhammed and his followers might find a sufficient number of readers to justify its publication.

It seemed necessary to make this statement both as an explanation and as an apology; and it is but right to add that the whole is here printed as it was written; for, as the author's studies have for some years run in an entirely different direction, he has not ventured upon a revision of this slight memorial of former labours. He has [illegible]mpted to approach in any way the question [illegible] orthography of Oriental names, which is one on which even Oriental scholars are not at all agreed, and in which many changes have taken place since these pages were written; but he believes that his original desire was to adopt such forms as, without being vulgarly corrupt, would sound least harsh to those who were not acquainted with the languages to which they belong.

14, Sydney Street, Brompton,
January, 1855.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

SEC. I.—Sketch of the People and physical Geography of Arabia Felix 1

SEC. II.—History of Hamyar, and of the expeditions of the Tobbaas till the introduction of Christianity . 13

SEC. III.—Introduction of Christianity into Arabia Felix, or Hamyar—[illegible]—Theophilus Indus—The later Tobbaas 26

SEC. IV.—The ancient state of Ethiopia, or Abyssinia—Its connection with Hamyar—Martyrdom of the Christians of Nadjran—Conquest of Yaman . . . 40

SEC. V.—Early history of Hirah and Ghassan—The Mâlouk-al-Towâïf—Subjection of the northern Arabs to Rome—Introduction of Christianity amongst them—Persian wars—Euthymius—Simeon Stylites—Saba 63

SEC. VI.—Embassy from Justinian to Ethiopia—Revolution in Yaman—Accession of Abrahah 86

SEC. VII.—Reign of Abrahah—Condition of Christianity in Yaman—St. Gregentius—Expedition against Mecca 92

SEC. VIII.—Hostile occupation of Hirah by Harith—Death of Kobad—Accession of Nousherwan—War between Hirah and Ghassan—and between Persia and Rome—Arabian Poets—Lebid—Amru'l-Kais . . . 101

SEC IX.—Origin of the Monophysite heresy—Council of Constantinople—of Ephesus—of Chalcedon—its consequences—Progress of the Eutychians in the reign of Anastasius—Severus—The persecution by Justinian 109

SEC. X.—Progress of the Monophysite doctrines in Arabia, &c.—Jacobus Baradæus—Their progress in Abyssinia—in Mesopotamia and the north of Arabia—Turbulence of the Arabian chiefs—State of Christianity in Arabia Felix—The Phantasiasts—Divisions between the Arabs and Romans—History of Mondar, king of Ghassan—and his son 125

PAGE

Sec. XI.—Domestic dissensions amongst the Arabs—Their Battles—Poets—Hareth—Amru ben Kelthûm—Ascha—Christianity in Hirah—Conversion of Noman abu Kabus 137

Sec. XII.—Last Abyssinian kings of Yaman—History of Seif Dzi Jezen—Invasion and conquest of Hamyar by the Persians—Death of Seif—Hamyar reduced to a province of Persia 145

Sec. XIII.—Birth of Muhammed—History of Muhammed to the fall of Mecca—Poets—Caab, Lebid, &c.—Views of Muhammed—his Religion—Character—Literature of Arabia—Muhammed's attempts on the Idolators—on the Christians—and on the Jews . 152

Sec. XIV.—Wars between the Persians, Romans, and northern Arabs under Maurice and Heraclius—Progress of Muhammed against the Christians of Arabia—Message to the king of Persia—Death of Khosroës Parviz—Conversion of Badhan—Dissensions among the Christians—Copts—Christians of Nadjran—Christians of Arabia seek protection from Muhammed—Gabala, last king of Ghassan—Embassy of Heraclius—Battle of Muta—Conquest of Hirah—Death of Muhammed—State of the Christians in Arabia, &c.—Conquest of Syria—Conclusion 175

Appendix.

(A) History of the tribes of Tasm and Hodais . . 190

(B) History of Dzu Nowass 192

EARLY CHRISTIANITY IN ARABIA.

SECTION I.

The peninsula of Arabia was divided by the old geographers into three parts: the desert plains of the north-east, which bordered on the Euphrates and the Syrian frontier; the province of Petræa, at the northern extremity of the Red Sea; and the richer and more extensive tracts of Arabia Felix. This latter division is chiefly included by native writers under the general and comprehensive term of *Al Yaman*, which in signification coincides with its Roman epithet.[1] On the north the territories of Yaman extended into the mountain ranges of the interior, and were bounded perhaps by the extensive deserts that spread out towards the Persian Gulf; on the west and south it was separated from Africa by the

[1] اليمن from يمن *felicity*. We find the real Arabic name mentioned by several ancient authors. Εισι δε και ενδοτεροι αυτων, μη οντες της φυλης αυτων, αλλα του Ιεκταν, οι λεγομενοι Αμανιται, τουτ' εστιν Ομηριται. Theophanes, Chronograph. in Bibl. Pat. Gr. tom. ii. p. 283, οι λεγομενοι Ομηριται, τουτ' εστιν Αμανιται. Euthymius, in Mahomethias, p. 308. See Constant. Porphyrogenn. p. 68. and the Saracenica, p. 57.—Filia regis austri est regina Sabæ: nempe hoc regnum vocatur lingua Ismaelitica *Aljeman*. Aben Ezra, in Dan. xi. 6.

Red Sea; and its eastern coasts were washed by the waves of the southern ocean.[1]

In more ancient times, the land of Yaman was celebrated as the native country of myrrh and of frankincense. Its inhabitants, the Sabæi, formed the most powerful and extensive of all the nations of the Arabian peninsula. They were blessed with a redundance of the pleasures and conveniences of life. The earth was fertile and fruitful, and with little labour produced all that was required for the necessities or luxuries of mankind. The plains were covered with innumerable flocks. Extensive and numerous forests of myrrh, cinnamon, and frankincense, mixed with the sweeping palm and the tall and slender reed, breathed their perfumes to the breeze which carried them far out on the neighbouring seas.[2] The people excelled all other nations in

[1] The knowledge which the ancient geographers possessed of the shape of Africa was very confused. They supposed that after turning Cape Guardafui, the African coast ran almost direct to the pillars of Hercules, and consequently they considered the ocean which lay to the south of Arabia Felix as the Atlantic. Ὑπερ δε τουτων ἡ Ευδαιμων εστιν, επι μυριους και δισχιλιους εκτεινομενη προς νοτον, μεχρι του Ατλαντικου πελαγους. Strabo, lib. xvi. c. 4. p. 384.

[2] Agatharchides, Peripl. Rubr. Maris, ap. Geogr. Gr. Min. tom. i. p. 63. Diodorus Siculus. Strabo. Solinus, c. 33. Pliny gives the following estimate of the extent of the spice woods.—Sylvarum longitudo est schœnorum xx. latitudo dimidium ejus. Schœnus patet Eratosthenis ratione stadia xl. hoc est pass. quinque D. Aliqui xxxii. stadia singulis schœnis dedere. lib. xii. c. 14.

wealth, enriching Syria with gold, and supplying the Phœnician navigators with lucrative cargoes.[3] The seas too were celebrated for the quantity and quality of their pearls.[4] The value of the productions of Sabæa were equalled only by the magnificence of the temples and palaces which adorned its cities. Supported by columns of gold and silver, and covered with gems and precious stones, they almost exceeded in splendour the magic buildings of oriental fable. The wealth of the Arabians was exhibited in a profusion of pompous couches and tripods, in gorgeous bowls, and richly ornamented cups.[5] The expenses of the royal household for a single day were estimated at fifteen Babylonian talents.[6]

We are naturally led to suppose that these accounts which the ancients give of the riches and magnificence of the people of Arabia Felix are considerably exaggerated. When we turn, however, to native authors, we find the rich and fertile fields of Sabæa, watered by innumerable streams and canals,[7] covered with gardens, and woods, and flowers, and universal

[3] Agatharchides, p. 64. [4] Plin. Hist. Nat. lib. xii. c. 18.

[5] Agatharchides, Peripl. p. 65.

[6] Τα δ'αναλωματα λεγει της ἡμερας εις τον βασιλεα, και τας περι αυτον γυναικας και φιλους, γινεσθαι ταλαντα πεντεκαιδεκα Βαβυλωνια. Heraclides apud Athenæum, lib. xii. p. 252. Ed. Bas. 1535.—The Babylonian talent was about £228 of our money, fifteen talents would therefore be £3420.

[7] Mesoud, p. 160 (in Schultens, Hist. Joctanid.)—Compare the account of the canal described by Herodotus as the work of the Arabian king, lib. iii. p. 185.

verdure, and adorned with cities and magnificent buildings, affording a theme for praises exceeding even the glowing descriptions of the Greeks.[1] The inhabitants of these fertile districts differed widely in their character from the wandering Arab of the desert. They were subject to kings, and governed by laws, and enjoyed all the advantages of social life. Some were employed in agriculture, others were shepherds, and others as merchants sought distant lands by sea, and exchanged native products for those of India and Ethiopia, or explored their pathless way through the northern desert, guided only by the stars of heaven.[2] Commerce is the source of wealth. The Arabians were the carriers of the eastern ocean, and the trade of India, that trade which afterwards contributed so much to the riches of Persia, had been monopolised by the merchants of Sabæa from the patriarchal days of Jacob.[3] The capitals of Egypt and Phœnicia owed their splendour in a great measure to the Sabæan merchandise which passed through them,[4] and the

[1] Mesoud, ib. "A person might ride," he observes, "at a quick pace, over a country bearing everywhere this delightful appearance, for a month in length or breadth. And any one thus travelling, either on horse or foot, may proceed all the way through a continuance of groves and gardens, so that the sun will never once incommode him with its rays, the country being everywhere covered with trees and shrubs."

[2] Απο των Αρκτων, by the bears. Diod. Sic. lib. ii. p. 156.

[3] Vincent, Periplus, vol. i. Prel. Disq.

[4] Vincent, ibidem. See Ezekiel xxvii. 21, 22.

treasures of Solomon himself were drawn from the mines and warehouses of Arabia.[5] The wealthy and the noble lived in the same magnificence and luxury that has ever been characteristic of the princes of the east, and we may parallel the writings of Arabs and Greeks in describing the pride and splendour of their domestic life,[6] and their political prosperity.[7] But, although they bore the character of a soft and luxurious people, they still preserved that of being free, liberal, and brave. After having been successively subjected by Ethiopean and Persian conquerors, they still enjoyed the same character, "exulting," says a Persian writer, "in their liberty, delighting in eloquence, acts of liberality, and martial achievements, and thus making the whole earth red as wine with the blood of their foes,

[5] 2 Chron. ix. and 1 Kings, x.

[6] Ergo incolæ ejus lautissimam et mollissimam vitam degere, unctissimo in statu lautissimoque eodem. Mesoud, p. 160. كان لهم من التيه والعجب والكبر على ساتر الامم—fastu, jactantia, et superbia reliquos Arabiæ populos superabant. Geogr. Arabs, Clim. 2. pars 6.—

Arabesque molles.—Catull. Od. xi. 5.

Thuriferos, fœlicia regna Sabæis.—Valerius Flacc. Argon. lib. vi.—Conf. Agatharchidem, supr. citatum.

[7] &c. وكانت—Istæ autem regiones in proverbium olim missæ, pulchris florentes institutis eorum, qui mores rectissimos et virtutum præstantiam assectarentur, &c. Mesoud, p. 162. See Agatharch., Athenæus, &c. Μοναρχουσι δε παντες, και εισιν ευδαιμονες. Strabo, lib. xvi. p. 385.

and the air like a forest of canes with their tall spears."[1]

The period at which the kingdom of Saba or Hamyar flourished, as in the free states of Greece and Rome, was the golden age of Arabian poetry;[2]

[1] Ferdoussi, quoted by Sir W. Jones.

[2] Die güldene Zeit der Dichtkunst, die jetzt in den Jahrbüchern der Araber aus Frömmigkeit die Zeit der Unwissenheit genannt wird, &c. Michaelis, Introduction to his edition of Erpenii Arabische Grammatif, p. xxxviii. The following anecdote is given by Ibn Khallakan, in the life of Hammad Arrawihah. "Hammad was the most conversant of men in the history, the poetry, the genealogy, and the language of the Arabs; for which reason, the princes of this family (of the house of Ummaiya) invited him to their society, honoured him with their esteem, and loaded him with their favours. One day the khalif Alwalid, in his assembly of learned men, said to Hammad, 'How do you substantiate your right to the name of Arrawihah (the narrator) which is usually given you?' He replied, 'Because I can relate, Commander of the Faithful, the works of every poet which you are acquainted with, or have heard of; I can, moreover, relate the works of those poets which you are not acquainted with, and have not heard of.' The khalif then asked, 'What number of poems do you retain in memory?' He said, 'A great many; for I will undertake to repeat to you, for every letter of the alphabet, one hundred poems of the largest description, all made before the introduction of Mahommetanism, independent of such poetry as has been formed since that æra.' The khalif said, 'I will prove you in this matter.' Hammad then related, till the khalif being tired, appointed some others to hear him; and when Alwalid was informed that he had actually repeated two thousand nine hundred odes of the poetry anterior to Mahommetanism, he

literature was universally encouraged and patronised by the munificence of the great,[3] and the study of eloquence and philosophy was ardently prosecuted.[4]

The Arabs of the times of ignorance, as the Moslem term the ages which preceded Muhammed, were not less celebrated for their skill in astronomy, astrology, and other sciences, than their descendants in the days of Islam.[5] The religion of the Hamyarites resembled that of the idolatrous nations who surrounded them, and their devotions were addressed

ordered one hundred thousand dirhems to be given to him." History of the Mahommetan empire in Spain.

[3] The poet Zohair celebrates an Arabian noble, Hossain, for his munificence and love for learning. His relations having censured him for distributing his money among "viros eruditos, doctos, atque paupertate oppressos," he answered in the words of the poet:—

Nos donant suis liberales tam largiter bonis,
Et nos liberalium his utemur sordide bonis?

Ecchelensis, Hist. Arab. p. 142.

There is an epigram of the same poet on an Ethiopian prince, after the Abyssinian conquest, marrying a fair Arabian maid, which is thus translated.

Vidi Æthiopem atræ simillimum nocti
Candidam amplexibus stringentem puellam,
Cui dixi: Heu nequam! naturæ ne ordine pervertas,
Albæ diei conjungens nigerrimam noctem.—*Id.* p. 143.

[4] Abulfarag. ap. Pocock. p. 6. Ecchelensis, ibid.

[5] Certe non minus excelluerunt in studiis Philosophiæ, Astronomiæ, Astrologiæ, Medicinæ, Poesis, Oratoriæ, aliarumque disciplinarum antiqui illi Arabes seculi ignorantiæ, quas vocant, quam sub Mahometismo juniores.—Ecchelensis, Hist. Orient. p. 142.

to a multitude of deities, of which the principal were represented by the sun, the moon, and the planets;[1] but amongst their philosophers there were many who acknowledged but one chief deity, the creator and director of the universe.[2] The head seat of the Arabian worship was situated amongst the northern mountains, in the same place where the faithful still direct their pilgrimage.[3] Their ideas of a cosmogony, or creation, and many of their philosophical tenets resembled those of Chaldæa, Egypt, and Syria, and of the older Greeks.[4] They believed in the immortality of the soul, its separation from the body after death, its future state of reward and punishment,[5] and many held the Pythagorean and Indian doctrine of its transmigration.[5] Mental liberty and

[1] Θυουσιν ἡλιῳ, και σεληνῃ, και δαιμοσι επιχωριοις. Philostorgius.

[2] Warner, ap. Spanheim, Introduct. ad Hist. Nov. Test: Sæc. vii.

[3] Warner, ib. Ecchelensis, Hist. Orient. p. 147. The temple at Mecca is distinctly referred to by Diod. Sic., and it was probably the temple of the sun mentioned by Theophrastus, (Hist. Plant.) in the following passage. Και εφασαν ακουειν, ὁτι συναγεται πανταχοθεν ἡ σμυρνα και ἡ λιβανωτος εις το ἱερον το του ἡλιου. Τουτον δ' ειναι μεν των Σαβαιων ἁγιωτατον δε πολυ των περι τον τοπον.

[4] Ecchelensis, p. 150. Resurrectionem mortuorum et judicium ultimum plurimos professos fuisse, quare ad defuncti alicujus sepulchrum camelum alligabat absque cibo et potu, ut scilicet in resurrectione equites resurgerent, camelum equitaturi Arabum more. Warner, ib.

[5] Ecchelensis, ib. Hottinger, Archæolog. Orient. p. 10. Pococke, p. 135.

social independence have ever been favourable to the arts, but of their progress in Arabia historians have left us in ignorance. In architectural works they certainly were not destitute of skill; the city of Sanaa was celebrated for its lofty towers, and is compared by Abulfeda to the modern city of Damascus. Mariaba is said to have been remarkable for the beauty of its public edifices and walls, the latter of which were six miles in circumference; and Sabota or Sabotha was distinguished by its sixty temples.[6]

Arabia Felix contained several other petty states, governed by their own kings,[7] but they were all subject to the king of Hamyar, who was called the great king,[8] and whose influence extended from the Red Sea to the Persian Gulf.[9] Next to the Nabatæi, or people of Petra, according to the ancient geographers, was the district of the Minæi, which appears to correspond with the Arabian province of Hedjaz. Their chief town was Carna, to the south

[6] Plinius, Nat. H. lib. vi. cap. 28.

[7] Pococke, Spec. Hist. Arab. p. 65, 66. Strabo, lib. xvi. p. 385.

[8] Pococke, ibid.

[9] Uno verbo, cum ad Jectanis genus hi scriptores (*i.e.* Arabes) referunt Homeritas et Amanitas, eos intelligunt populos qui Arabiæ Felicis πεζαν occupant oceanum versus, ab Arabico sinu usque ad Persicum. Bochart, Phaleg, lib. ii. c. 15. Marcianus Heracliotes, describing the Red Sea, says, εν τουτῳ δε τῳ μερει της θαλασσης και το των Ὁμηριτων εθνος τυγχανει το των Αραβων επαρχων γης, μεχρι της αρχης του Ινδικου διηκον πελαγους, p. 13.

of Mecca, or Macoraba.[1] Between this region and the district of Hamyar were the Cassanitæ, who possessed a country rich in gold, which appears to coincide with the Tehama, on the western coast.[2] Part of this territory, where it adjoined to Sabæa or Hamyar, was occupied by the Chaulanitæ, Carbi, or Cembani, and the Arii, both brave and warlike tribes.[3] This district is now called Khaulan. The extremity of the continent, where it approaches the coast of Africa, was held by the Catabeni, or Gebanitæ; their capital was Tamna, and they had a port called Ocelis, close on the straits. This district was very productive in frankincense.[4] From the Cassanitæ and the Catabeni, the district which more particularly bore the name of Hamyar or Saba stretched along the south-eastern coast, as far as the district of the Chatramotitæ or Adramitæ, which coincides both in name and situation with the modern Hadramaut, and whose chief town was Cabatanon.[5] Between the Chatramotitæ and the Omanitæ was the deep bay of Sachalites, on the southern promontory of which, called Syagrus, was a celebrated port for exporting frankincense and other spices.[6] The district of the Omanitæ is the modern

[1] Bochart, p. 134, &c. Strabo, ibid. [2] Id. p. 156.

[3] Pliny. Agatharchidas. Bochart, p. 162, et Geograph. Arabs, ibi cit.

[4] Strabo, ibid. Plin. Dionys. Perieg. Bochart, p. 151.

[5] Strabo, ibid. Bochart, p. 113. [6] Arrhian, Peripl.

Oman.[7] More to the north, along the Persian Gulf, lay several other unimportant districts, included chiefly under the modern name of Lachsa.

The Arabian peninsula is considered by Niebuhr as an immense pile of mountains, encircled with a belt of flat, arid, sandy ground, which extends from Suez around the whole peninsula to the mouth of the Euphrates, and is continued on the north by the province of Petra and the deserts of Syria. The principal mountain chain runs nearly parallel with the Red Sea, at a distance of from thirty to eighty miles, increasing in elevation towards the south. Another chain runs from the southern part, parallel with the ocean, to the mountainous shores of Oman. The interior is believed to be an elevated table land, occupied towards the north by a series of deserts. The *Montes Marithi* of Ptolemy, the Nedjed el Arud, appear to be a ridge of limestone rocks, stretching towards the south, and gently declining towards the east. Between them and the districts of Yaman and Oman is the desert of Alkaf, which is said once to have been a terrestrial paradise, till, for the impiety of its inhabitants, it was covered by a deluge of sand.[8] In the maritime regions the Arabian towns were few and inconsiderable, and were chiefly ports or trading towns. The inhabi-

[7] Bochart, p. 250.

[8] Niebuhr, Malte Brun, &c. The Arabian legend may be consulted in Ebn al Ouardi, p. 46, and the Kitab Aldjuman, p. 138, &c., in tom. ii. of the Notices et Extraits de la Bibl. du Roi.

tants of these unfruitful districts who were not resident in the towns, or engaged in commerce, lived principally by fishing, and gained from foreign nations the appellation of Icthyophagi. But the fertile valleys and mountain plains abounded in rich and beautiful towns, and well peopled villages.[1] Mariaba, or Saba, the metropolis of Hamyar, and the fairest city of Arabia, was situated on a gentle elevation amongst the mountains which are included in the modern province of Hadramaut, three or four stations from the city of Sanaa.[2]

[1] Πολεις δ'εν μεν τη παραλιᾳ μη πολλας ειναι, κατα δε την μεσογαιαν πολλας οικουμενας καλως. Eratosthenes, apud Strab. p. 387. lib. xvi.—Niebuhr describes these mountain plains, particularly the plateau of Nedjed, as still covered with towns and villages, and abounding in all kinds of fruits. "Most of the Arab tribes south of Zohran," says Burckhardt, "belong to the sect of Zeid; they live in villages, and are chiefly what the Arabs call *Hadhar*, or settlers, not Bedouins; but as they keep large herds of cattle, they descend, in time of rain, into the eastern plain, which affords rich pasturage for cows, camels, and sheep." They trade, he adds, both to the coast and with the Bedouins of the north. Travels in Arabia, Appendix, p. 378.

[2] Agatharchides, Peripl. p. 63. Abulfeda's Arab. p. 58. Geogr. Arabs, Clim. 2. part 6.

SECTION II.

Of the original inhabitants of Yaman there were, we are told, several tribes, of whom some, such as those of Tasm and Hodais, became extinct by war and other causes.[3] The tribes of Ad and Thamoud, which were settled, the former in Hadramaut and the latter in the province of Petra, were said to have been visited with the divine wrath for their impiety.[4] Those who had first occupied the boundaries of Syria, the Tahites, Chasdites, Bahrites, Giahites, and Salehites, were afterwards extirpated by other settlers from the south, who took possession of the districts of Ghassan and Hirah.[5] The Arabians are divided by the native historians into two distinct races: the posterity of Kâhtan, or Joktan, the son of Heber, who were termed *Al Arab al Ariba*, the pure Arabs, and the race of Adnân, the lineal descendants of Ishmael, who were called mixed Arabs, *Al Arab al Mostareba*. From the latter, who were intermixed with the descendants of Jorham, one of the sons of Kâhtan, and occupied the district of Hedjaz,

[3] See Appendix, A.

[4] Pococke, p. 36, 37.

[5] Ecchelensis, Hist. Orient. c. iii. On the early Arabian tribes consult Masoudi, in the Notices et Extraits de la Bibliothèque du Roi, tom. i. p. 28, 29.

were descended the tribe of Koreish. Kâhtan was the first that wore a diadem in the land of Yaman.[1]

Kâhtan was succeeded by his son Yârab, who is celebrated as the first who spoke the language and introduced the ceremonials of Arabia.[2] Yeshab, the son of Yârab, was succeeded by Abd-Shems, or Saba, the founder of the city of Mariaba, and of the great reservoir in its neighbourhood, which collected the streams as they flowed from the mountains, and distributed them over the plains.[3] He was the first

[1] Abulfeda, p. 3. (in Schultens' Hist. Joct.)—Pococke, Spec. Hist. p. 56.

[2] Hamza, p. 19. Pocock. ibid. He was said to be the first who introduced the formula by which the kings of Hamyar were saluted when crowned. It was ابيت اللعن may you refuse malediction. ان اهل الجاهلية كانوا يحيون الملوك بقولهم ابيت اللعن ولا يخاطبون به غيرهم حتي ان احدهم اذا تولي الامارة والملك قيل له فلان نال التحية * "The Arabians formerly saluted their kings with these words, *may you refuse malediction*: nor did they ever address any one else with this formula: so that when any one was raised to the throne, they said of him, such a one has received the salutation." Almotarazzi, in libro Mogreb. (ap. Pocock) Ebno'l Athir gives the following explanation of it. ابيت اللعن كان هذا في تحايا الملوك في الجاهلية والدعا لهم ومعناه ابيت ان تفعل فعلا تلعن بسببه وتذم * "This formula, *may you refuse malediction*, with which they used to salute their kings, and wish them prosperous, had this meaning—take care you do nothing on account of which people may curse you, and speak ill of you." See Abulfed.

[3] Abulfed. p. 2. Mesoud, p. 167.

of the Arabian kings who undertook warlike expeditions, and enriched his country with the spoils of his enemies, and is said to have received the name of Saba from the numerous captives which he brought into Yaman.[4] Amongst his sons were Hamyar, Amru, Cahlân, and Ashaar.[5]

Hamyar was the first of the descendants of Kâhtan, who, by his own and his father's wars, reigned over the whole of Yaman.[6] He drove the remains of the tribe of Thamoud out of Yaman into Hedjaz,[7] and was one of the bravest, most skilful, and handsomest men of his time. He is said to have received the name of Hamyar, which signifies *red*, from the colour of the garments which he constantly wore, and to have been the first king of Arabia who had a crown of gold.[8]

Hamyar was succeeded by Wathil, Al Secsac, and Yâfar, during whose reigns the kingdom seems to have lost much of its power, being divided between two sovereigns, one of whom reigned in Hamyar, the other in Hadramaut.[9] After Yâfar reigned the usurper Dzu Ryash, or Amir, who was deposed by Nôman Al Moâphir, the son of Yâfar. Asmach,

[4] Abulfed. ib. Nuweir, p. 48. [5] Abulfed. p. 4.

[6] Hamza, p. 22. [7] Abulfed. ib.

[8] Nuweir, p. 50. Al Jannabi and Ahmed Ebn Yusef. ap. Pococke.

[9] Abulfed. p. 6. Hamza, p. 22. According to others Hamyar was succeeded by his brother Cahlân, and he by Abu Malech, the grandson of Saba. Nuweir, p. 50.

the son of Nôman, was succeeded by Shaddâd, who was descended from Matata, a son of Abd Shems; he was a great warrior, and carried his victorious arms into Africa.[1] After him reigned his brothers Lokmân and Dzu Sedad, and under the son of the latter, Hareth, or Al Rayish, the fifteenth king of Hamyar, the two parts into which the kingdom had been divided were reunited. This prince first took the title of tobbaa, which was afterwards given to all the Hamyaritic kings.[2] Hareth, who was a great warrior, carried his arms into India, and fought many battles in Azerbijan.[3] The sixteenth and seventeenth kings were Dzulcarnain Assuab,[4] and Dzulmenâr Abrahah, who invaded Africa, and penetrated as far as Soudan.[5] The son of Abrahah was Africcus, who also entered Africa, subdued Barbaria, and built a city to which he gave his name, and

[1] Abulfeda, p. 6. Other kings are mentioned by some as succeeding Shaddâd, as Morthed, who was called Dzu Aud, and his son Amrum. Gjanabi, and Firuzabad, ap. Pocock.

[2] Hamza, p. 22. Abulfeda, p. 6.—*Tobba'*, et Tobbâï. Titre qu'ont porté les anciens rois de l'Iemen, tels qu'ont été ceux de Hadhramout, de Hemiar, etc. Ce titre leur est aussi particulier, que celui de Khosroés aux Sassanides de Perse, celui de Khan et de Khakan aux Turcs, de Fagfour à ceux de la Chine, de Césars à ceux des Romains et des Grecs, et des Faraons et des Bathalmions à ceux d'Egypte. On appelle ces rois au pluriel Arabe *Tababêah* et *Tabbâiah*.—D'Herbelot.

[3] Hamza, ib. Nuweir, p. 50. Abulfed. p. 6.

[4] Abulfed. ib.

[5] Abulfed. ib. Hamza, p. 22. Nuweir, p. 52.

thence continued his career to the western coast. He is also said to have driven the remains of the people who had been expelled from their country by Joshua, and who had settled about Egypt and the maritime parts of Africa, to the farthest boundaries of the west, "the place which they now occupy."[7] His brother, Dzuladhaar Amru, the nineteenth king, was called the lord of the terrible, because he had invaded the land of the pigmies, and at the sight of some of them, whom he had brought captives to Yaman, his people were "greatly terrified."[8] He was afterwards deposed by his people, and Sjerabîl, a descendant of Secsac, ascended the throne in his place.[9] Hadâd, the son of Sjerabîl, was the father of Balkis, who, after reigning in Hamyar twenty years, went to Palestine, and was married, they tell us, to Solomon.[10]

[7] Hamza, p. 22, 24. Nuweir, p. 52, 4. Abulfed. p. 6. Gjannabi, Ahmed Ebn Yusef, and the scholiast on the poem of Ebn Abdûni, cited by Pococke. From the similarity between this tradition and that which the Jews and early Christian writers appear to have held, I think we may look on it as of Hebrew origin. The tale of Procopius is well known, of the two columns found in Tingitana, with a Phœnician inscription, which he translates—ἡμεις εσμεν οἱ φυγοντες απο προσωπου Ιησου του λησταυ νιου Ναυη. A Moorish author, Ibn el Raquique, states that the inscription was on a stone upon a mountain at Carthage. Marmol. lib. i. c. 25.

[8] Hamza, p. 22. Nuweir, p. 54. [9] Abulfeda, p. 6.

[10] Abulfeda, p. 8. Nuweir and Hamza, ibid. It is hardly necessary to remark that Balkis was the "queen of Sheba" of Scripture.

Yasasin, the brother and successor of Balkis, by his unbounded liberality gained the title of Nasher 'al Neam,[1] and in his warlike expeditions he penetrated into Africa as far as the great sandy desert; in attempting to cross which part of his army was buried in the sand, and he was compelled to relinquish the enterprise. He erected a brazen statue on the border of the desert, with an inscription on its breast in the Hamyaritic characters, warning future adventurers of the dangers and almost inevitable destruction they must encounter, should they proceed beyond it.

The twenty-fourth king of Hamyar was Shamar, the son of Africcus, or according to others of Yasasin, surnamed Abu Karb, or the father of affliction, from his victories and cruelties. He is celebrated as one of the greatest warriors that ever bore the crown of Yaman. Since the time of Al Hareth the eastern boundaries of the Hamyaritic expeditions were Azerbijan and the frontiers of India; it was left for Shamar to extend his conquests far beyond those ancient limits. He first defeated the Tahtars in Azerbijan, which he had invaded by way of Mousul. On his return from this expedition he received an embassy from one of the kings of Hindûstan, who was desirous of forming an alliance with him, and from the Indian ambassador the tobbaa first heard of the distant regions of China.

[1] Abulfed. ib. Hamza, p. 24. Nuweir, p. 56.

The rare and valuable articles from that country which were brought with the embassy as presents, excited his cupidity, and induced him to undertake an expedition against that distant empire. He began by subduing Khorasan, and from thence he passed by Balk, through the beautiful regions of Sogd, to its capital, which he destroyed, and which, when rebuilt, was from this circumstance called Samarcand or Shamarchand, *i. e.* Shamar destroyed it. He afterwards proceeded through Turkistan, to the frontier of Hindûstan, and through Thibet, where

Amongst Arabian writers there are celebrated *four pleasant places of the world,—Damasci* viridarium, fluvius *Obullæ* in Basru urbe, rivus *Bauvanitarum,* et *Sogd Samarcandæ* وصغد سمرقند. Ezzedin Abdelazir, apud Casiri, Biblioth. Hispan. Arab. tom. i. p. 208. The Oriental geographers dwell with rapture on the beauties of Chorasm and Sogd, covered everywhere with orchards, and fields, and gardens. "Vallis enim Al Sogd," says Abulfeda, "viii dierum itinere, a limitibus Bocharæ ad confinia Al Botom exporrecta, prata viridis, et hortos continuos complectitur. Horti a fluviis perpetuo irriguis terminantur. Ultra prata, ultroque [fluvii] latere arva sunt, et ultra arva, animalium libere vagantium pascua. Nullibi gentium arbores pulchriores, aut amœniores." Chorasmiæ, &c. descript. p. 32. inter Geograph. Minor. tom. iii. See also Golii not. in Alfergan. p. 172, 173. "If a person stand on the قهندز *Kohendiz* (or ancient castle) of Bokhara," says the Oriental Geographer, translated by Sir W. Ouseley, "and cast his eyes around, he shall not see any thing but beautiful green and luxuriant verdure on every side of the country: so that he would imagine the green of the earth and the azure of the heavens were united." p. 236.

he left twelve thousand Arabs as a body of reserve to retire upon in case of defeat. When he approached to the borders of China, the monarch of that empire, trusting more to stratagem than arms, dispatched one of his ministers to meet the tobbaa, whom he found on the point of crossing the desert, at the distance of about ten days from the Chinese territory. The minister had cut off his own nose, and pretended to be flying from the cruelty of the emperor as a deserter to the king of Hamyar. When Shamar questioned him as to the road, the distance, and the water, he answered, "between thee and water there are but three stations." The king, therefore, deceived by this answer, carried with him provisions only for three days, and entered the desert. After the three days were passed, the Arabian army ran short of water, and perished among the sand.[1] This expedition is placed by the generality of Arabian historians in the reign of Ghustasp king of Persia, though some make it contemporary with Bahman.

[1] Abulfeda, p. 8. Hamza, p. 26. Nuweir, p. 58. Ouseley's Oriental Geography, Appendix, p. 293. See also Price's Essay towards the history of Arabia, p. 98. Some historians state that Shamar was successful in his invasion of China, and that he returned to Yaman, after an absence of seven years, loaded with the plunder which he had taken from the cities of that distant empire. Nuweir, p. 68-70. This version of the story has most likely originated from confounding Shamar, with his descendant Al Akran, the second invader of China. This seems to be confirmed by the circumstance, that those authors place the expedition of Shamar at the same time as that of Al Akran.

Shamar was succeeded by his son Abu Malêc, who, delaying to seek revenge for his father's death, perished in a useless expedition into Africa.[2] After his death the crown passed from that branch of the family of Saba who traced their descent from Hamyar, to the descendants of Cahlân. The successor of Abu Malêc, and the first of this dynasty, was Amran, who had the reputation of being a great diviner or prophet.[3] He was succeeded by his brother Amrou, who was surnamed Mozaikia, or the tearer, because he every evening tore in pieces the clothes which he had worn during the day, that they might not be used a second time;[4] he died in the reign of Ali, between Yaman and Hedjaz.[5] The sceptre then again reverted to the descendants of Hamyar, in the person of Al Akran, the son of Al Malêc, who was contemporary with the Persian king Bahman, about A.A.C. 465.[6] This tobbaa immediately undertook to revenge the death of his grandfather Shamar. He marched to Samarcand, part of which he is said to have rebuilt, and proceeding perhaps in the steps of Shamar's army, of which remains might, it is suggested, still be found on the road, entered China, destroyed its capital, and founded there a city, in which he left a colony of thirty thousand Arabians, whose descendants

[2] Nuweir, p. 58. Hamza, p. 28. Abulfeda, p. 8.
[3] Abulfeda, ibid. [4] Abulfeda, ibid.
[5] Eichhorn, Monument. Antiq. Hist. Arab. p. 152.
[6] Abulfed. p. 8. Hamza, p. 28.

still remained, preserving the dress and manners of Arabia, and noted for their strength and bravery, in the time at which Hamedoun wrote, which was about the five hundred and fifty-third year of the Hegira.[1] It was this tobbaa, who, after a seven years absence, returned to Hamyar, laden with the spoils of China.[2]

Dzu Abshan, the son of Akran, was contemporary with the second Darius, and with Alexander the Great. He destroyed the remains of the two tribes of the Tasmites and Gjadasites which still remained in Yaman.[3] Between the death of Dzu Abshan, and the accession of Kolaicarb, a period of a hundred and sixty years transpired, during which a series of tobbaas must have reigned. Kolaicarb reigned thirty years, and was succeeded by Assaad Abu Carb.[4] During the period since the reign of Dzu Abshan, the kingdom of Hamyar appears to have been divided, and was governed, like Persia after Alexander's death, by numerous petty princes.[5] These were one by one defeated and killed by Assaad, and the dominions of Hamyar restored to their former extent. One of the first acts of this king was the invasion of Hedjaz. The territory about Yatreb,

[1] Nuweir, p. 58, 60.

[2] Nuweir, p. 72. See Price's Essay.

[3] Abulfeda, p. 8. Hamza, p. 28.

[4] Hamza, p. 30. Abulfeda, p. 8—10. Abulfeda's chronicle appears here somewhat confused.

[5] Hamza, p. 30. Nuweir, p. 60.

or Latrippa, the modern Medina, was at this time occupied by a colony of Jews, who are said to have been descended from those who fled from Palestine and Syria, before the armies of Baktunusser, or Nebuchodonassur. Having reduced the greater part of Hedjaz, Assaad left his son Algabtoun as governor at Yatreb, and is said to have been pursuing his march towards Syria, when he was overtaken by messengers who informed him that the Jews of Yatreb had rebelled, and had put his son to death. Assaad returned, vowing that he would not leave a Jew alive in Hedjaz, but he was met by some of the tribes from about Yatreb, who came to expostulate with him, justifying their conduct by representing to him the injuries and oppression which they had suffered from his son. By these excuses the anger of the tobbaa was appeased, he being, according to Arabian writers, no lover of injustice. He was also met by the tribe of the Hudeilites, who urged him to attack Mecca, and plunder the Caabah, tempting him with their account of the unbounded riches it contained. But the people of Mecca also succeeded in diverting his hostility by the accounts they gave him of the sanctity of the place, persuading him that it was under the peculiar protection of the Deity, and that those who had incited him to this sacrilegious action only aimed at his destruction. He remained several months at Mecca, offered every day magnificent sacrifices in the Caabah, and adorned it with tapestry, affixing to

it also a door of gold.[1] It was at this time that the Jews were first introduced into Hamyar.

Till the latter part of the fourth century, Christianity seems scarcely to have been known in the southern parts of Arabia. It was not till after the reign of tobbaa Assaad Abu Carb, when the Persians began by their increasing power to threaten the empire, that the Arabians had any connection with their Roman neighbours. Although there is no doubt abundance of exaggeration and fable in the Arabian annals previous to this period, the historical outlines may be correct. The armies of the tobbaas seem to have been both enterprising and brave, and their conquests extensive, but the situation of the country of Hamyar was not favourable for the seat of a mighty empire, and the Arabs took no steps for the preservation of their alleged acquisitions.[2] Their exploits, therefore, must be considered only as plundering expeditions. They were generally conducted towards Irak and Mesopotamia, but the increasing power of Persia had checked their incursions in this direction, and the Arabians would consequently look upon their Persian neighbours as encroachers

[1] Nuweir, p. 60. Nikbi ben Massoud, Notices et Extraits de la Bibl. du Roi, tom. ii. p. 366, et seq.

[2] Les Arabes n'ont jamais conquis que de pays flats,—Ils n'entendent nullement l'art de conserver la culture des pays conquis,—were premises which the Arabian historian has exhausted three chapters to prove. See the summary of his work in the Journal Asiatique, tom. i. p. 267.

upon their rights, and would seek every opportunity of revenge. In the invasion of the Persian territory by the Arabs, on the death of Hormuz, the king of Hamyar, tobbaa Hassan, the son of Assaad, raised a numerous army, and proceeded into Irak, where he was meditating still greater conquests, having made preparations, according to the Arabian writers, to follow the footsteps of his ancestors into China. His followers, however, opposed his design, unwilling to be carried so far from their families and possessions, and prevailed upon his brother Amrou to murder the tobbaa, which he effected whilst Hassan was sleeping in his tent. The army thereupon returned to Hamyar, and Amrou ascended the throne.[3]

The latter days of the life of Amrou were troubled by a guilty conscience, and sleep became a stranger to his eyelids. On his return with the army to Hamyar, he endeavoured to atone for the murder of his brother, by the punishment of the chiefs who had urged him to it; but the people conspired against him and put him to death,[4] and gave the crown to his younger brother Abd Alâl. Abd Alâl is said to have embraced the Christian faith, but from political motives, never to have openly professed it.[5]

[3] Nuweir, p. 66. See there the different account of these reigns which he adduces from another author.

[4] Nuweir, p. 72. [5] Abulfeda, p. 10.

SECTION III.

At what period Christianity was first introduced into Arabia Felix it is now impossible to determine. Many causes, however, combine to make us believe that it was long after it had been spread over the neighbouring nations.

The mountains and deserts which defended the southern Arabians from the arms of the Persian kings, presented an insurmountable obstacle to every Asiatic or European invader, and even hindered any permanent connection with the rest of the world. Before the expedition of Ælius Gallus, the peninsula had never suffered from foreign invasion.[1] Alexander is indeed said to have contemplated the reduction of Arabia Felix; the fleet of Nearchus was preparing to assist the expedition by sea,[2] and the Macedonian army would perhaps have marched along the rich plains of the Euphrates, which opened to the odoriferous regions of Yaman;[3] but these designs were terminated by the death of their projector. The Roman army under Ælius Gallus seems to have

[1] "Indi quin, Auguste, tuo dat colla triumpho,
Et domus intactæ te tremit Arabiæ."
Propertius, lib. ii. 10. v. 15.
See Horace, lib. i. od. xxix. 2; and lib. iii. od. xxiv. 1.

[2] Dio Cassius. Arrian. [3] Curtius, lib. v. c. 1.

landed in the country of the Thamudites, near the Elanitic Gulf,[4] and to have proceeded in the direction of Yatreb and Mecca to Nadjean,[5] which he appears to have destroyed, as well as Asca, Athrulla, Marsuaba, and several other cities;[6] amongst which was Mariaba itself, which he found to be six miles in circuit.[7] But what the Arabian arms could not do, was effected by the climate and the country; and the Roman army was obliged to retire, with the honour only of having experienced no successful opposition from a people who had been hitherto unconquered.[8]

The religion and theology of the Arabians of Yaman bore doubtless a great resemblance to that of the surrounding nations. They professed the doctrines of the Sabians, and in common with them, acknowledged Abraham as their ancestor. Attached therefore to a superstition made reverend by its antiquity, and in which their great progenitor Abraham was reported to have been educated,[9] the

[4] Vincent, Peripl. p. 302, &c.

[5] *Egran*, Plin. πολις Αγρανων, Strabo.

[6] Strabo, lib. xvi. c. 4. p. 407.

[7] Et supra dictam Mariabam, circuitu vi mil. passuum. Plin. lib. vi. c. 28.

[8] Τους δε αλλους απεβαλεν, ουχ ὑπο πολεμιων, αλλα νοσων, και κοπων, και λιμου, και μοχθηριας των οδων, κ. τ. λ. Strabo, p. 408.

[9] ידוע שאברהם אבינו עליו השלום גדל באמונת הצאבה ודעתם שאין אליה רק הככבים

Notum est Abrahamum patrem nostrum educatum esse in fide Zabæorum, qui statuerunt nullum esse deum præter stellas. Maimonides, More Nevochim, pars iii. c. 29.

idolatrous inhabitants of the happy Arabia must be supposed to have received slowly and reluctantly the severe doctrines of Christianity. From the little connection too which existed between them and the rest of the world, the old worship would be more identical, less mixed with foreign creeds, and consequently more opposed to their admission. At the time of the introduction of the Christian faith, the Jews appear to have penetrated into the peninsula in considerable numbers, and to have formed also a great impediment to its progress.

Before the followers of Christianity became public objects of persecution, their proceedings were so private and little known, particularly in the more distant parts of the empire, as to have escaped entirely the page of history. The first rudiments of the Christian faith are believed to have been planted among the Hamyarites, who were known, in common with the people of Hindûstan and Ethiopia, under the general name of Indians, by the apostle Bartholomæus.[1] Till the age of Constantine, however, the existence of Christians in Arabia seems not even to have been known. During the reign of that emperor, an unexpected circumstance favoured their cause. The details of this event are given by the historian Nicephorus.[2] A

[1] Eusebius. Hist. Eccl. iii. 1. Asseman, Biblioth. Orient. tom. iii. p. dxcii. See the next note.

[2] The history of Frumentius may be collected from Nicephorus, ix. 18; Ruffinus, x. 9; Theodoret, i. 23, &c. Some of the

Tyrian philosopher, named Meropius, emulating the travels of Plato and the ancient sages, and

modern ecclesiastical historians, among whom we may reckon Pagi, and particularly the writers on the Ethiopian or Abyssinian history, as Ludolf and Bruce, have asserted that the scene of the history of Frumentius was Ethiopia. Besides the positive testimony of Nicephorus, it will not be difficult to show that the account of the other ecclesiastical writers will not authorise such a supposition. This transaction took place, they say, in India; that is, according to Pagi and Ludolf, Abyssinia or Auxume. Apud Indos, (says the Roman Martyrology for the 27th Oct.) S. Frumentii Episcopi, qui ibi primum captivus, deinde episcopus ab Athanasio ordinatus, Evangelium ea provincia prædicavit." The name of India was given both to Abyssinia and Arabia Felix. Plerique veterum Indos [Æthiopes] vocaverunt, ut fere omnes zonæ torridæ nationes, quarum speciale nomen ignorarent. Imo, ipsum mare rubrum Indicum a nonnullis veterum appellatur, quo minus mirum accolas illius Indos nominatos fuisse. Ludolf. Hist. Æth. i. 1. And Damianus a Goëz, in his Relatio de legatione Matthæi Abessinorum ad regem Lusitaniæ legati, calls the king of the Abyssinians *magnum Indorum imperatorem.* But the name was as often, perhaps more frequently, applied to Arabia. In the cosmographies of Æthicus and Julius Honorius, when giving a summary of the countries of the east, Arabia is included under the general appellation of India (Æthici Cosm. p. 28. Excerpt. Jul. Honor. p. 7), whilst neither apply the name of India to any part of Africa, and both mention Ethiopia by its proper name. (Æthic. p. 48. Honor. p. 18.) Arrhian calls the Arabians an Indian nation,—*προσοικει δε ταυτη εθνος Ινδικον, οι Αραβιες καλεομενοι.* Peripl. Nearch. p. 4. All the ecclesiastical historians call the southern Arabians, Indians—*τοδε των Ινδων εθνος τουτο Σαβα μεν παλαι, απο της Σαβα μετροπολεως, τα νυν δε Ὁμηριτας καλεισθαι.* Philostorgius, Hist. Eccl. ii. 6. et iii. 4. *Σαβαι,* say the Chronica of Eusebius and Cedrenus, *αφ' ου Αραβες Ινδων.*

instigated by the example of Metrodorus, who had recently travelled in search of knowledge among

.The point in question is, therefore—which of these Indians, the Arabians or the Ethiopians, did Frumentius convert? In the first place, we have the positive testimony of Nicephorus that they were the Hamyarites. Among the authorities adduced by Pagi to support his contrary opinion is that of Socrates, who says it was *Indiam illam Æthiopiæ finitimam*, which, he seems to think, denotes the region of Auxume, as neighbouring on the interior Ethiopia. Pagi, Critica, tom. iv. p. 198. Now we find this India mentioned by Ruffinus (Hist. Eccl. lib. i.)—in ea divisione orbis terræ quæ ad prædicandum verbum Dei sorte per apostolos celebrata est, cum aliæ aliis provinciæ obvenissent, Thomæ Parthia, et Matthæo Æthiopia, eique adhærens *citerior* India Bartholomæo dicitur sorte decreta. Socrates, from whom he has taken the passage, says, (lib. i. c. 19) ἡνικα οἱ Αποστολοι κληρῳ την εις τα εθνη πορειαν εποιουντο, Θωμας μεν την Παρθων αποστολην ὑπεδεχετο, Ματθαιος δε την Αιθιοπιαν, Βαρθολομαιος δε εκληρουτο την συνημμενην ταυτῃ Ινδιαν. Chrysostom, indeed, makes Thomas the apostle of Ethiopia, Θωμας δια βαπτισματος λευκαινει τους Αιθιοπας. (Homil. in xii. Apost. tom. viii. Append. p. 11.) Now, who the Indians were that Bartholomæus visited, we may learn from Sophronius (c. 7.) Βαρθολομαιος ὁ Αποστολος, Ινδοις τοις καλουμενοις Ευδαιμοσιν, εκηρυξε το ευαγγελιον του Χριστου,—and from the Menæa (part ii. p. 197.) Bartholomæus in Indiam Felicem profectus, ibique cruci affixus, decessit,—they were the people of Arabia Felix. It is very evident from what Ruffinus says, that the India visited by Frumentius was the same as that in which Bartholomæus preached the gospel, and he distinguishes Ethiopia from India in the same chapter. (x. 9.) In this history of the Abyssinian invasion, the Hamyarites and Ethiopians are distinguished as the Homerite Indians and the Auxumite Indians. Malala, p. 163. Nicephorus, xvii. 22. Theophanes, p. 188. And

the distant people of India,[1] determined to visit the Hamyarites of Arabia Felix. He was accompanied by two young men who were both his kinsmen and his disciples in philosophy. On their return in an Egyptian ship, they were compelled to put into one of the Hamyaritic ports for a fresh supply of provisions. It happened at that time that the peninsula was in a state of warfare; and on landing they were treated by the natives as enemies, and either slain or made slaves. Amongst those who perished, were the philosopher and most of his attendants. Of his two companions, who were carried to the king, one, named Ædesius, was made the royal cup-bearer; to the other, whose name was Frumentius, and in whom he perceived more than ordinary abilities and learning, the king entrusted the care of his books and treasures. Having both served him faithfully for some years, on the death of the monarch they were rewarded by his queen with their liberty, and

Johannes Asiæ Episcop. (ap. Asseman. tom. i. p. 359), calls the Ethiopian king who conquered Hamyar, king ܐܘܣܝ ܐܠܐ of the *interior* or *further Indians*, whereas Ruffinus declares that the India visited by Bartholomæus was *India citerior*. Another argument of Pagi's is that mention is made of Frumentius, a bishop of Auxume, being deposed for Arianism in 356 by the successor of Athanasius, (Athanas. Apol. ad Constant. Baron. p. 563.) but if he had been the same as the other, it would certainly have been a circumstance of sufficient importance to be mentioned.

[1] Metrodorus visited the Brachmans in India, according to Cedrenus, ad an. xxi. Constant. Magn.

received permission to go wherever they wished. Availing themselves of her liberality, they were preparing to return to their native city of Tyre, when the queen earnestly requested them to stay, and undertake the guardianship of her infant son, and of the kingdom, until he should arrive at a proper age to assume the administration. They obeyed, and the first use Frumentius made of his power, was to cause strict search to be made for the few Christians who might live under his jurisdiction. Those whom he found he treated with great kindness; he built them a place of worship, and soon by his favour and encouragement increased the number of converts to the Christian faith. As soon as the young king was capable of ascending the throne, Frumentius and Ædesius returned to Tyre, where the latter was raised to the dignity of a presbyter. From Phœnicia Frumentius repaired to Alexandria, where he related his adventures to Athanasius, then lately elevated to the head of the church, representing to him that many people in Hamyar were well inclined towards the true faith, and begging that he would immediately send them a bishop and priests. The primate, having consulted the bishops who were then at Alexandria, judged that no one could be better fitted to govern the Christian church in Arabia than the person who had first introduced it there, and Frumentius returned as bishop to Hamyar, where he built many churches, and greatly conduced by the example of

his own piety to the propagation of the Christian faith.[1]

The next Christian mission to Hamyar occurred in the reign of Constantius. Amongst the hostages who had been delivered to the Romans by the people of Adiabene, was a man named Theophilus, afterwards known by the surname of Indus, or the Indian.[2] His native country appears to have been the island of Dibu, or Divu, at the mouth of the river Indus.[3] He soon displayed extraordinary

[1] Tantopere vero eum laudatum esse ferunt, ut parem cum Apostolis laudem et honorem tulerit.... Et locupletem nactus gratiam, plurima Deo constituit templa. Nicephorus Callistus, Hist. Eccl. lib. viii. c. 35. Perhaps we may still recognize some traditions of the history of Frumentius among the Arabian histories. By two authors, cited by Sir W. Ouseley, (Travels, vol. i. p. 369—71), we are informed that the Arabs of Nadjran were first converted by a Syrian Christian, who was taken by robbers and carried among them. Jews in the earlier times might naturally be confounded with Christians; it often happens so in Roman historians. The tobbaa Hassan, with his brothers Amrou and Zerraah, were said to have been left infants on the death of their father Assaad, and during their minority "the sovereign power was exercised by an Arab Jew of the Benni Lakhem. As soon as Hassan had attained the age of discretion, Rebbeiah (the name of the Jew), who was probably his tutor or guardian, retired with his children to Heirah." (Modern Traveller, Arabia, p. 37.) It was about this time, which must have been nearly contemporary with Constantine, that Abd Celâl reigned, who was reputed to be a Christian.

[2] Nicephorus, ix. 18.

[3] Philostorgius, lib. iii. num. 4. Pagi, p. 529. Gothofredus,

abilities, conformed easily to the manners of the Romans, embraced a monastic life, and was made a deacon by Eusebius of Nicomedia. His reputation became so great that he was chosen by the emperor to conduct a magnificent embassy, accompanied with two hundred horses of the pure breed of Cappadocia, and other rich presents, to the court of Hamyar. The eloquence of Theophilus, seconded by the magnificence of his presents, and by the value at which the Roman alliance was estimated, are said to have prevailed upon the Arabian king to embrace the religion of Christ. He built three churches in different parts of his dominions, one in his capital, which is called by Nicephorus Taphar; another in the port of Adane, or Aden, where the Roman merchants were accustomed to resort; and a third in a Persian port on the Arabian Sea, which is supposed to have been Hormus. After having consecrated these churches, and having settled the affairs of Arabia, Theophilus continued his route with success to several countries of the east, and on his return was held in great honour and esteem by his Roman brethren.[1]

Comment. leg. 2. Theod. de Legat. Concerning the isle of Dib or Divu, see Hyde, annotat. in Peritsol, Itin. Mund. p. 26.

[1] Nicephorus, lib. ix. c. 18. Suidas has given a very high character of Theophilus. *Θεοφιλος. ουτος απο Ινδων επανελθων, εν Αντιοχειᾳ διηγεν. Εκκλησιαν μεν αφωρισμενως ουδεμιαν εχων αυτος, κοινος δε τις ων, ως πασαις αυτον μετ' αδειας επιφοιτᾳν ως ιδιαις. εξον, βασιλεως αυτον ες τα μαλιστα διατιμης τε πασης, και αιδους αγοντος. και των αλλων απαντων, οποσοις επισταιη, μετα*

Asseman considers that Theophilus merely converted the Christians, who were already spread over the southern part of the peninsula, to the Arian heresy, of which he was a zealous adherent. The number of Christians in Arabia at this time must certainly have been considerable. No less than four bishoprics were established in the kingdom of Hamyar.[2] The Christians of Yaman were still, however, few in comparison with those amongst the Arabs of Syria and the north, who were generally understood by the name of Arabian Christians. Of the tribes mentioned by Arabian authors as having embraced the worship of Christ, few are included within the limits of Arabia Felix. But it is not improbable that Christians and Jews are often confounded. One writer tells us that Christianity flourished in the tribes of Rabiah, Ghassan, and Kodaah, and Judaism in Hamyar.[3] We know, however, that in Hamyar there were many Christians. Ibn Khalican enumerates, as Christian tribes, those of Bahrah, Tanouch, and Taglab.[4] To these may be added, on the authority of Abulfeda and Safio'ddin, many tribes in the neighbourhood of Nadjran, or

πασης προθυμιας αυτον υποδεχομενων, και το της αρετης αυτου μεγεθος καταπληττομενων. ην γαρ ὁ ανηρ κρεισσον η ως αν τις δηλωσει λογῳ, ως αν τις των αποστολων εικων. κ. τ. λ.

[2] Asseman, Biblioth. Orient. tom. iii.

[3] Auctor Libri المستطرف ap. Pocock. Spec. Hist. Arab. p. 141.

[4] Ibn Khalican, ap. Pocock. ib.

Nedjeraun, who had a church and bishop in common.[1] The inhabitants of Yatreb too, according to Shahristan,[2] were a mixture of Jews and Christians:

The troubles which followed the death of the tobbaa Amrou, the predecessor of Abd Celâl, were favourable to the extension of Christianity over the peninsula. According to the historian Nuweir, when Amrou had weakened the power of Hamyar, by the destruction of the chiefs who had instigated him to the murder of his brother, the opportunity was seized by Rabya Ibn Modhar, a descendant of Cahlan, who with a considerable army invaded the kingdom, defeated and slew the tobbaa, and assumed the sceptre. The kingdom of Hirah is said to have been given by the Persian monarch to his son.[3] After his death the crown again reverted to the race of Hamyar, probably in the person of Abd Celâl, who was succeeded by a son of Hassan, only known by the appellation of tobbaa,[4] which he was the last who rendered celebrated by his actions. It is recorded of him that he placed his sister's son, Amrou, as king over the Maadites, and that Mecca and Yatreb, and even Hirah, were subject to him. He adorned anew the temple of Mecca, embraced Judaism, and brought

[1] Abulfed. and Safio'dd. ap. Pocock. ib.

[2] Shahristan, ap. Pocock. ib.

[3] Nuweir, p. 63.

[4] Abulfed. p. 10. Hamza, p. 34. Nuweir, p. 62.

with him to Hamyar some Jewish doctors. It was in his time that the league was made between the people of Yaman and the tribe of Rabyah.[5]

This tobbaa was succeeded, according to Abulfeda, by Hareth, a son of Amrou,[6] or, according to others, by Morthed, the son of Abd Celâl.[7] On the death of Morthed the kingdom of Hamyar was divided amongst his four sons, who reigned together, each with a separate diadem. On their way to Mecca these kings were attacked by the tribe of Chenan, three of them slain, and the fourth thrown into chains.[8] The throne of Hamyar is said to have been next occupied by their sister, who was deposed and put to death by the people.[9] After her reigned in succession Wakiah, the son of Morthed,[10] and Abrahah Ibn Sabak, who is celebrated only for his learning and liberality.[11] The next king was Sahban, the son of Morthed,[12] whom many of the Arab tribes, not included in the kingdom of Hamyar, acknowledged as their sovereign. He placed Hareth, the son of Amrou, over the Saadites, who divided his kingdom between his three sons, placing Hogr over the tribe of Asad and Kenan, Sjerhabîl over that of Keis and Temeem, and Salus over Rabyah.

[5] Hamza, p. 54. [6] Abulfeda, p. 10.

[7] Hamza, p. 34. Nuweir, p. 62. Abulfeda makes Morthed the successor of Hareth.

[8] Hamza, p. 34. Nuweir, p. 62. [9] Nuweir, ibid.

[10] Abulfed. p. 10. Hamza, p. 34.

[11] Abulfeda and Hamza, ib. Nuweir, p. 74. [12] Idem, ibid.

On the death of Hareth, the people of Asad, Keis, and Temeem rose against Hogr and Sjerhabîl, and drove them away. On the news of this insurrection, Sahban raised an army and led it against the tribe of Modhar, which was joined by that of Rabyah. The result of this war was that Sahban was defeated and slain. Alsabah, the son of Abrahah, succeeded to the throne, and proceeded to take vengeance on the Maadites for the death of his predecessor. In the battle of Cilab, which followed, the forces of Hamyar were entirely defeated by the Maadites, under their former leader Colaib, and the tribe of Maad was released from its subjection to Hamyar during the life of its chieftain.[1] The crown of Hamyar was next usurped by Lachnya Dzu Shanathir, who was famed only for his tyranny and for his profligacy. He was slain by Yusef Dzu Nowass, who succeeded him and became a convert to Judaism.[2]

The tolerant spirit of the Arabian idolatry afforded equally a safe asylum to the persecuted disciples of Zoroaster, numbers of whom settled in Bahhrein, to the Jew, and to the fugitive Christian. As long as the kings of Hamyar adhered to their ancient superstition, each of these sects was allowed the free exercise of its religious ceremonies, and the public profession of its faith. But no sooner did the

1 Nuweir, p. 76.

2 Abulfed. p. 10. Hamza, p. 16. Nuweir, p. 76. Taberita, p. 102. Mesoud, p. 140.

followers of Judaism gain power, than the disciples of Jesus, whom they considered as their bitterest enemies, began to experience their resentment. The causes which drew upon the Christians of Arabia Felix the enmity of Dzu Nowass, are variously reported by the Arabian historians, but the most credible are agreed that he was excited to their persecution by his Jewish advisers and subjects.[3]

[3] See the authorities cited in the last note, and the ecclesiastical writers of contemporary history. I have inserted a different account in the Appendix B. from D'Herbelot. It will show how little faith can be placed in the stories which the commentators on the Koran have fabricated.

SECTION IV.

THAT region of Ethiopia which was known to the Romans as the kingdom of Auxuma, was called by the Arabians Al Habesh, of which the modern name of Abyssinia is merely a corruption. Its eastern boundary is the Red Sea, and on the north it adjoins to Nubia; and in its physical geography it bears a great resemblance to the Arabian peninsula. It is described as a country of mountains. Like Arabia, it is characterized by its coast chains; a high ridge runs parallel to the shores of the Indian ocean as far as Cape Guardafui, from whence it continues in a westerly direction to the strait of Bab-el-Mandeb, inclosing the frankincense and myrrh country, which extends considerably to the west of Azab. From the strait this chain follows the course of the Red Sea, until it terminates in the sandy plain at the Isthmus of Suez.[1] The interior of Abyssinia is described by Salt as a table land, having a gentle inclination towards the north-west, and presenting two great steeps, one on the east, towards the Red Sea, the other on the south, towards the interior of

[1] Bruce, Travels, vol. ii. p. 302, 8vo. Edinb. 1805. Suez was the ancient Sebaste, whence the Arabic Siwas, corrupted into Suez.

Africa, which is supposed to be a branch of the Djebel-el-Kamri, or Mountains of the Moon.[2]

The Abyssinians were connected with the people of Arabia not only by their situation,—they were a people of the same family, and their kingdom perhaps originated from some of the plundering expeditions of the early tobbaas of Hamyar.[3] Their

[2] Salt's Abyssinia, p. 350. The Arabian geography of Abyssinia may be seen in Hartmann, de Geographia Africæ Edrisiana, p. 54, et seq.—Abu'l-Maala Alaeddin Muhammed ibn Abdo'l-Bak wrote a book في محاسن الحبوش de Excellentiis Habessinorum, in which he said they were derived from Al Habesh, who was the same as Cush, the son of Canaan. Gagnier, not. in Abulfed. Hist. Muham. p. 23.

[3] Ludolf asserts the Arabian origin of the Abyssinians, "Indigenæ enim non sunt; sed venerunt ex ea Arabiæ parte, quæ *felix* vocatur et mari rubro adjacet; unde facile in Africam transfretari potuerunt. Abassenos enim in Arabia olim habitasse, atque Sabæis sive (quod idem est) Homeritis accensitos fuisse, et veteres geographi testantur, et multa alia convincerant argumenta."—Hist. Æth. lib. i. c. 1. The Arabian writers explain many of the words of the Koran which are not now in use from the Abyssinian.—Gagnier, not. in Abulfed. p. 23. Their form and colour are constantly compared by Bruce to those of the Hamyaritic Arabs. In the early history of Hamyar, the expeditions of its kings are all confined to Africa. Mr. Salt has objected to the Arabian origin of the Abyssinians, and thinks the inhabitants of Auxuma to have been a Berber race. His principal argument, however, against their identity with the Hamyarites is that Arabian historians collected by Schultens distinguish them by their colour, and because one of the princes of Hamyar entreated the Persian emperor to drive out those crows (*corvi*) who were hateful to his countrymen. The Ethiopians may have been much darker than the Hamyarites;

Arabian origin is proved by the identity of their manners, their physiognomy, and their language, and even in some measure by their own traditions. Abyssinia resembled Arabia Felix also in its productions, its aromatic woods of myrrh and frankincense. Pure gold was found in many parts in abundance. In place of the camels of Arabia, it boasted of the finest elephants in the world.

Abyssinia is at present divided into three great divisions: that of Tigre, comprehending the tract between the Red Sea and the Tacazze; that of

the Sheygya and other Bedouin Arabs of Africa are even blacker than the Ethiopians; the cause in both cases might be the same. Seneca urges the *burnt* colour of the Ethiopians as a proof of the heat of the climate—primo Æthiopiam ferventissimum esse, indicat hominum adustus color. Nat. Quæst. lib. iv. c. 2. p. 629. The Arabians of the peninsula could not particularize the Ethiopians for their colour, for they distinguish themselves by the same term: when they would say that Muhammed was sent to convert not only the Arabs, but also foreign nations, the Greeks and the Persians, they say he was sent to الاسود والاحمر the *black* (the Arabs) and the white, (Abulfed. Hist. Muham. c. vii.);—and, which is still more remarkable, in the collection of Arabian proverbs edited by Schultens, the Arabs are designated by that very same term of *crows*—العربان غربان * والسودان سيدان—the Arabs are *crows*, the blacks, *i.e.* the negroes, wolves (Elnawabig, No. 27); and the Arabian scholiast (Samachsjar) actually represents their colour as the reason of the term. The oriental geographer, translated by Ouseley, observes, "The inhabitants of Bajeh [a place between Abyssinia, Nubia, and Egypt] are blacker than the Abyssinians, *like the Arabs*," (p. 13.), that is, like the African Arabs.

Amhara, to the west of the Tacazze; and the provinces of the south. The province now called Tigre was the seat of the ancient monarchy. At the north-west end of an extensive and fertile valley, between two hills, about one hundred and twenty miles from the coast, stood the capital, the city of Auxuma, or Axum, the ruins of which still bear witness to its former magnificence.[1] The annals of the Ethiopians trace its origin to the time of Abraham.[2]

The Ethiopians were a people little known in the earlier periods of history. Many circumstances make us believe that the ages in which they flourished preceded the earliest authentic annals of the gentile writers. Settled in an elevated region, which in tropical climes has generally been found to be the seat of civilization,[3] they seem to have been once celebrated for learning, and in the early ages of the post-diluvian world, the district of Auxuma was probably the mother country of the wisdom and inhabitants of Egypt.[4] The Ethiopians boasted,

[1] See Valentia, Bruce, &c. [2] Bruce, vol. ii. p. 305.

[3] In America, Humboldt found that the traces of ancient civilization were always confined to the cool climate of the mountain plains. "In ganz Mexico und Peru findet man die Spuren grosser Menschenkultur auf der hohen Gebirgsebene. Wir haben Ruinen von Pallästen und Bädern in 1600 bis 1800 Toisen Höhe gesehen." (Ansichten der Natur, p. 147, band. i.) The civilization of ancient Arabia was confined to the mountain plains of Hamyar; in Africa, to the high plateau of Auxuma.

[4] A thorough investigation of the early connection between

according to the historians of Greece, that they were the most ancient people of the globe, that amongst them first originated the worship of the gods, and that they were the first inventors of religious rites and

Egypt and Ethiopia might lead to interesting results. In the short space of a note it would be useless to attempt it. Diod. Sic. amongst the ancients has avowed his opinion that the Egyptians were an Ethiopian colony. (lib. iii. c. 2. p. 175.) He informs us that the Ethiopians had formerly used hieroglyphics, and that the hieroglyphics were called *Ethiopian letters*, and he seems to think that they originated amongst that people:—*περι δε των Αιθιοπικων γραμματων, των παρ' Αιγυπτιοις καλουμενων ιερογλυφικων, ρητεον, ινα μηδεν παραλειπωμεν των αρχαιολογουμενων. συμβεβηκε τοινυν τους μεν τυπους υπαρχειν αυτων ομοιως ζωοις παντοδαποις και ακρωτηριοις ανθρωπων, ετι δ' οργανοις, και μαλιστα τεκτονικοις. ου γαρ εκ της των συλλαβων συνθεσεως η γραμματικη παρ' αυτοις τον υποκειμενον λογον αποδιδωσιν, αλλ' εξ εμφασεως των μεταγραφομενων και μεταφορας μνημη συνηθλημενης.* (c. iv. p. 176.) Heliodorus says—*ταιναν γραμμασιν Αιθιοπικοις ου δημοτικοις, αλλα βασιλικοις εστιγμενην, ἁ δε τοις Αιγυπτιων ιερατικοις καλουμενοις ὡμοιωνται.* (Heliod. Ethiop. lib. iv. p. 174.) . We find Egypt mentioned in the book of Genesis as a flourishing kingdom as early as the days of Abraham and Joseph, and at the same time we find such a marked difference between the Egyptians and the people of Syria and Palestine that the former were not allowed by their laws to eat of the same food. The Egyptian colony cannot therefore have come from the north. In the time of the patriarchs the kingdom of Egypt is believed to have been confined to Upper Egypt and the Thebaid. Bruce thinks that the colony which founded Thebes came from Siré, in Ethiopia. One of the principal deities of the Ethiopic and Arabian theologies was named Siris; Diodorus says that the proper name of the Egyptian deity was Siris, which the Greeks, by prefixing O, transformed into Osiris.

ceremonies. Hence it was generally believed that their sacrifices were peculiarly acceptable in heaven, and that they were under the immediate protection of the deity.[1] In reward for their piety, Diodorus assures us, they had remained as free as the Arabs of the peninsula, and had escaped invasion even from the arms of Hercules and Bacchus.[2] We are further informed that their worship was directed in the first place to an immortal being, whom they looked upon as the creator of the universe; and secondly, to a deity of inferior power, and partaking of mortal nature;[3] perhaps these coincided with the demiurgic and created gods of the Egyptian and Platonic philosophers. Their theologies embraced also as inferior deities the sun and the moon, and others which were analogous to, perhaps the prototypes of, Jupiter, Hercules, Pan, and Isis.[4] In his attempt to reach Ethiopia from Egypt, Cambyses experienced the strength and bravery of its inhabitants, the reports

[1] Diod. Sic. lib. iii. c. 2. p. 175—Διο και την παρ' αυτοις ευσεβειαν, he observes, διαβεβοησθαι παρα πασιν ανθρωποις, και δοκειν τας παρ' Αιθιοψι θυσιας μαλιστ' ειναι τῳ δαιμονιῳ κεκαρισμενας. This idea appears to have been very old among the Greeks, for Homer says—

Ζευς γαρ επ' Ωκεανον μετ' αμυμονας Αιθιοπηας
Χθιζος εβη μετα δαιτα· θεοι δ' ἁμα παντες ἑποντο.

Il. A. 423.

Homer doubtlessly heard of their fame from the Egyptians.

[2] Diod. Sic. p. 175.

[3] Θεον δε νομιζουσι, τον μεν αθανατον, τουτον δ' ειναι τον αιτιον των παντων· τον δε θνητον, ανωνυμον τινα, και ου σαφη. κ. τ. λ. Strabo, lib. xvii. c. 2. p. 473. [4] Diodorus, p. 179. Strabo, ib.

of whose vast riches had excited his cupidity ;[1] later authors have praised their beauties and their virtues.[2] During the reign of the Ptolemies, when the trade of the Red Sea was carried on partly through the Egyptian ports, and Ethiopia was made by their fleets a place of less difficult access, the language and some of the refinements of Greece were introduced ;[3] and it was a favourite resort of the later kings of this family, for the purpose of hunting the elephant.[4] Like Arabia, this country afforded a refuge to multitudes of Jews, of whom many are to be found there at the present day.[5] Christianity is supposed to have reached Ethiopia as early as the days of the apostles ;[6] but it can be ascertained with more

[1] Herodotus, lib. iii. p. 191, &c. The Ethiopians sent Cambyses one of their bows, with the following message :—The king of the Ethiopians advises the king of the Persians, that when his soldiers are able to bend this bow with ease he may venture to invade Ethiopia, in the mean time let him thank the gods that they have not induced the Ethiopians to desire other countries than their own.

[2] Herod. ibid. Mela, lib. iii. c. 3.

[3] Κατα δε τον δευτερον Πτολεμαιον ὁ βασιλευς των Αἰθιοπων Εργαμενης, μετεσχηκως Ελληνικης αγωγης, και φιλοσοφησας. Diodorus, lib. iv. p. 178.

[4] Agatharchides, περι της Ερυθρας θαλασσης, p. 1. In the Adulitic inscription in Cosmas (p. 143), Ptolemy professes to have conquered the Arabians, και περαν δε της Ερυθρας θαλασσης οικουντας Αραβιταὶ.—Τους εις την Ομηριτην σημαινει· says Cosmas, τουτεστι τους εν τῃ ευδαιμονι Αραβιᾳ.

[5] Jewett's Christian Researches.

[6] They were reported to have been visited by Thomas (Chrysost. Homil. in xii. Apost. p. 11), by Matthæus (Ruffinus, lib. i.

certainty that there were Christians in the kingdom of Auxuma in the time of Athanasius, when their bishop, named Frumentius, was deposed for his doctrines.[7]

Ethiopia, when it was better known, became important to the eastern empire for its trade; and the merchants of Abyssinia shared with those of Arabia the commerce of the Indian ocean. From the port of Adulis, on the Red Sea, the ruins of which are still to be seen near the town of Zulla, about thirty miles to the south-east of Massowa, the ships of Auxuma visited the coast of India, and the island of Taprobana, then called by the Indians Sieladiba, and now known by the name of Ceylon.[8] This celebrated island was the common resort for the merchants of Ethiopia, Hamyar, Persia, India, and the distant

Socrates, i. 16), by Marcus (Makrizii Hist. Copt. p. 15), and by Bartholomæus, after he had traversed Arabia (Nicetas, p. 395). Theophilus passed over from the Homerites to the Auxumites. (Nicephorus, ix. 18, 19. Philostorgius, iii. 4. Theodoret. ap. Phot.)

[7] Athanas. Apol. ad Constant. p. 313. (Opera, ed. Par. 1698. tom. i.) The kings of Auxuma were then Αϊζανας και Σαζανας. Frumentius was created a bishop by Athanasius, p. 315. Ambassadors came to Constantine from Ethiopia and India in 325. Euseb. Vit. Constant. iv. 8. The Ethiopians are enumerated among the people who had received Christianity, by Athanasius (de Incarnat. p. 92), and by Chrysostom (Homil. ii. in Johan. tom. viii. p. 9.), Ινδοι, και Περσαι, και Αιθιοπες.

[8] Παρα μεν Ινδους καλουμενη Σιελεδιβα, παρα δε Ελλησι, Ταπροβανη. Cosmas Indicopleustes, Topograph. Christ. lib. xi. p. 336.

region of Sinde, or China.[1] It contained at this early period a Christian church and community, under the jurisdiction of the bishop of Persia.[2] The port of Adulis was frequented by the ships of Alexandria and Ela,[3] which returned laden with the produce of the frankincense country,[4] and the gold of Sasus.[5] Three days' journey from Adulis, and five from Auxuma, was the town of Koloë, the grand emporium of ivory, and of the wealth of the interior.[6] The trade, however, between the Auxumites and the Romans, at least after the removal of the seat of

[1] Εξ ὁλης δε της Ινδικης και Περσιδος και Αιθιοπιας δεχεται ἡ νησος πλοια πολλα, μεση τις ουσα, ὁμοιους και εκπεμπει .... εστι γαρ και αυτη μεγα εμποριον ὁμοιως και Σινδου, ενθα ὁ μοσχος η το καστοριν, και το ανδροσταχυν, και τῃ Περσιδι, και τῳ Ὁμηριτῃ, και τῃ Αδουλῃ, κ. τ. λ. Id. p. 337.

[2] Εχει δε ἡ αυτη νησος και εκκλησιαν των επιδημουντων Περσων Χριστιανων, και πρεσβυτερον απο Περσιδος χειροτονουμενον, και διακονον, και πασαν την εκκλησιαστικην λειτουργιαν. Id. ib. We are told by Sophronius that Christianity was introduced into this island by the Eunuch of Candace—Ευνουχος Καυδακης ... και εν Ταπροβανῃ νησῳ εν τῃ Ερυθρᾳ εκηρυξε το ευαγγελιον του Κυριου. In the time of the Nubian geographer Al Edrisi, there were still Christians remaining both in Sarandib or Ceylon (p. 32), and in Socotora (p. 23).

[3] Cosmas, lib. ii. p. 140.

[4] Εστι δε ἡ χωρα ἡ λιβανοτοφορος εις τα ακρα της Αιθιοπιας, μεσογειος μεν ουσα, τον δε Ωκεανον επεκεινα εχουσα. Id. p. 138.

[5] Αυτη ἡ Σασου χωρα ὑστατη εστι των Αιθιοπων, ενθα και πολυχρυσιον εστι, το λεγομενον Ταγχαρας. Id. p. 143.

[6] Arrian, Peripl. Eryth. Mar. p. 3. A curious account of the trade between Ethiopia and the interior of Africa will be found in Cosmas, p. 139.

empire to the east, appears to have been carried through Arabia. The deserts which lay between Ethiopia and Egypt hindered a commercial intercourse between those two countries by land;[7] and the neglected and bad navigation of the Red Sea towards the north was an almost equal impediment by sea. The trade with the Romans was therefore carried on by Roman merchants who resided in the ports of Ethiopia and Arabia, and the merchandise was transported in caravans to Syria, over the mountains to the north of Hamyar, and through the country of the Nabatæi.

The nadjash, or king of the Auxumites, who was contemporary with Dzu Nowass, is called in the Ethiopian histories Caleb, by the Greek historians Elesbaan, or Hellesthæus. Although we discover few traces of it in any historians, yet it is probable that the Hamyarites and their Ethiopian neighbours were often at war. The troubles which distracted the kingdom of Hamyar after the death of Amrou, were perhaps caused in part by an Abyssinian invasion. Rabyah Ibn Modhar had been compelled to seek shelter in Hirah from their power.[8] The king of Auxuma appears, from the inscription discovered

[7] Inter Ægyptum et Æthiopas arenarum inculta vastitas jaceat. Seneca Nat. Quæst. præf. lib. i. Conf. lib. iv. c. 2. p. 627.

[8] Nuweir (p. 74) says that the cause of the tobbaa's flight to Hirah was a dream, which portended the conquest of Hamyar by the Abyssinians—it is much more probable that he would fly from an actual invasion.

at Axum, to have laid claim to the kingdom of Hamyar as early as this period,[1] and the war which ended in the conquest of Yaman, was perhaps only a renewal of the national quarrel.

On the breaking out of the persecution of the Christians of Hamyar by Dzu Nowass, the Roman merchants engaged in the Ethiopian trade were among the first who experienced its effects. The rich merchandise contained in their caravans naturally excited the cupidity of the persecutors, the injuries which the Jews were represented to have suffered under the dominion of Rome were eagerly embraced as a pretext, and under pretence of retaliation the caravans were stopped and plundered on their passage over the mountains, and the merchants put to death. The nadjash was not slow in resenting the injury which his kingdom sustained by the interruption of the Roman trade. Messengers were dispatched to the tobbaa to expostulate, but without effect, and they were immediately followed by a powerful army.[2] After a long and obstinate

[1] The commencement of this inscription runs thus—Αειζανας βασιλευς Αξυμιτων και Ὁμηριτων και του Ῥαειδαν και Αιθιοπων και Σαβαειτων, κ. τ. λ. Aeizanas, king of the Axumites and of the *Homerites*, and of Rhaeidan and of the Ethiopians, and of the *Sabaites*, &c. The date of this inscription is fixed to an era immediately following the reign of Rabyah. See Salt's and Valentia's Travels.

[2] Johannes Asiæ Episc. ap. Asseman. Bibl. Orient. tom. i. p. 359. Jo. Malala, Chron. pars altera, p. 163. Theophanes, Chronograph. p. 144, &c. I shall generally cite John of Asia

war,[3] the king of Hamyar was reduced to the humiliating terms of paying tribute to the Abyssinian conqueror.[4]

Although the Abyssinians had long embraced Christianity, it does not appear to have been openly avowed by the royal family, at least all the old historians are agreed that Elesbâan was not a Christian. Theophanes calls him a Jew.[5] Influenced, however, by his commercial alliance with the emperor, and his profitable trade with the Christians, he appears to have been always favourably inclined towards them, and when he undertook the invasion of Hamyar, he had made a vow that, should he succeed in his enterprise, he would openly receive the religion of Christ, for it was, he said, in the cause of the Christians that he had taken up arms. Accordingly, after having subdued the kingdom of Hamyar, he hastened to fulfil his vow, by sending two of his nobles to the emperor to solicit a bishop and priests, who were willingly granted to him, according to his own choice. The ambassadors, having after some inquiries fixed upon one Johannes, as their bishop, returned with him and a number of priests to Auxuma, and the nadjash, with his courtiers and nobles, were baptized,

from the edition in the Syrischen Chrestomathie of Michaelis, as I have found it readier to refer to.

[3] Mesoud, p. 140.

[4] Metaphrast. ap. Sur. die 24 Octobr. (apud Baronium.)

[5] Ὁ των Εξουμιτων βασιλευς ενδοτερος εστιν της Αιγυπτου, Ιουδαϊζων. Theophanes, Chronograph. p. 188.

and erected churches in various parts of the kingdom.[1]

Soon after this, when the greater part of the Abyssinian forces had been withdrawn from Arabia, Dzu Nowass suddenly raised an army, and defeated those who had been left to secure the conquests of the nadjash.[2] No sooner had he thus regained possession of his hereditary kingdom, than the tobbaa prepared to wreak his vengeance on the now defenceless Christians; and all who refused to renounce their faith and embrace Judaism, were put to death, without respect to age or sex.[3]

The town of Nadjran, or Nedjeraun, on the north of Yaman, was inhabited by the Benni Hâleb, who had embraced the religion of Jesus, according to the Arabian historians, at the preaching of a Syrian missionary.[4] It was under the jurisdiction of a bishop, and had a church which was frequented by many of the Arabian tribes.[5] The Greek writers trace the introduction of Christianity into this town from the time of the embassy sent by Constantius to Arabia under Theophilus.[6] Against this place Dzu Nowass

[1] Johan. As. Episc. p. 19, 20. (Ed. Michaelis.) Jo. Malala, p. 164. Nicephorus, lib. xvii. c. 22. Cedrenus, &c.

[2] Metaphrastes, ap. Sur. in Baronius ad an. 522, 3.

[3] Metaphrastes, ibid. Johan. Episc. As. p. 21, 22, &c.

[4] Hamza, p. 38. Tabri and Zakaria Cazvine, ap. Ouseley, Travels, vol. i. p. 369, 71.

[5] Abulfeda and Safio'ddinus, apud Pocock. Spec. Hist. Arab. p. 141.

[6] Quædam tamen civitas frequens populo sita in Homeritide,

is said to have been instigated by the Jews of Yatreb.[7] On his arrival before it, he found it surrounded by a wall and ditch, and the whole town in arms, prepared to oppose him. The tobbaa laid siege to the place with a large army, ravaging the surrounding country, and threatening the inhabitants with extermination, unless they would publicly renounce the cross. Finding, however, from the firmness and bravery of the Christians in Nadjran, that he was not very likely to succeed by force, he had recourse to treachery; and on his taking a solemn oath that he would not injure one of the inhabitants, but that he would allow them the peaceful exercise of their religion, the town of Nadjran was surrendered.[8]

The king of Hamyar disguised his treachery no longer than was necessary to gain the object which he had in view by it. Nadjran was plundered by

quæ vocatúr Najran, cum jam longo abhinc tempore evenisset ad agnitionem veritatis, et pietatem suscepisset, nempe ex quo Constantius, magni Constantini filius, ad Sabæos, qui nunc vocantur Homeritæ, orti vero sunt ex Cætura Abrahæ, misit legatos. Metaphrast.—The town of Nadjeran is still reverenced by the Druses, (Burckhardt, Travels in Arabia, vol. ii. p. 387), as well as another town of the same name. Nadjeran is now in ruins. "When I communicated this fact," says Buckingham, "as I had had a previous opportunity of doing, the principal Druse of the company exclaimed, 'Alas! there are but two Nedjerauns in the whole world, and they are both in decline.'" Travels among the Arab tribes, p. 254.

[7] Hamza, p. 38.

[8] Metaphrast. Joh. As. Episc. p. 24.

his army.[1] Large pits were dug in the neighbourhood, and filled with burning fuel, and all who refused to abjure their faith, amounting according to the Arabian authors to many thousands, including the priests and monks of the surrounding regions, with the consecrated virgins, and the matrons who had retired to lead a monastic life, were committed to the flames.[2] The chief men of the town, with their prince, who is known by the name of Arethas, and who is called by the Arabian writers Abdallah Ibn Althamir,[3] a man distinguished for his wisdom and piety, were thrown into chains.[4] The tobbaa next sought their bishop, whose name was Paul, and when informed that he had been some time dead, he ordered his bones to be disinterred and burnt, and their ashes scattered to the wind. Arethas and his companions were urged to apostasy both by threats and persuasions, the Arabian king alleging that God, who was incorporeal, could not be killed or crucified—that Christ therefore ought not to be worshipped as a god, but should only be considered as a human being, and that he did not wish them to worship the sun and moon, or any created thing, but the one God who had produced all things, and who was the Father of all generation. But his insidious arguments were treated with contempt, and

1 Metaphrastes.

2 Abulfeda, p. 10. Hamza, p. 38. Nuweir, p. 80, Tabeir, p. 106. Mesoud, p. 140.

3 Nuweir, p. 80. Tabeir, p. 106. 4 Metaphrast.

Arethas declared that he and his companions were all ready to die in the cause of their Saviour. The tobbaa accordingly ordered them to be conducted to the side of a small brook or wady,[5] in the neighbourhood, where they were beheaded.[6] Their wives, who had shewn the same constancy, were afterwards dragged to a similar fate. One named Ruma, the wife of the chief, was brought with her two virgin daughters before Dzu Nowass; their surpassing beauty is said to have moved his compassion, but their constancy and devotion provoked in a still greater degree his vengeance; the daughters were put to death before the face of their mother, and Ruma, after having been compelled to taste their blood, shared their fate.[7] When he had thus perpetrated the tragedy of Nadjran, the tobbaa returned with his army to Sanaa.[8]

At the time when this event occurred, an embassy had been sent by Justin to the mondar, or king of the Arabs of Hirah, under the direction of the bishop of Persia and a presbyter called Abraham, to con-

[5] ܘܕܝ, Jo. As. Ep. p. 35. *Odias*, Metaphrast. وادى Wadi, is the common name in Arabia for a stream or mountain torrent, and also of a valley, which has generally a stream running through it.

[6] Jo. As. p. 35. Metaphrast.

[7] Metaphrast.—"I swear by Adonai, (ܐܠܗ ܐܠܗ ܡܪܝ)" says the tobbaa, in his letter to the mondar of Hirah, preserved by Jo. As. Ep. p. 30, "that I am exceedingly grieved when I think of her beauty, and of that of her daughters."

[8] Hamza, p. 34. Tabeir, p. 106.

ciliate their friendship, and endeavour to detach them from their alliance with, or rather dependence on, Persia. When he reached the camp of the Arab chief, a messenger had just arrived from the king of Hamyar, informing the mondar of the success and particulars of his expedition against Nadjran, and exhorting him to take similar measures against the Christians who lived under him. The bishop of Persia immediately wrote a circumstantial account of the sufferings of the Christians of Nadjran to his Roman brethren, in which he urged them speedily to take up the cause of the believers in Arabia.[1] Amongst the few Christians who had escaped the persecution of Dzu Nowass, was Dous Ibn Dzi Thaleban, who fled to the court of Constantinople, and implored the emperor to advocate the cause of his persecuted countrymen.[2] The emperor gave him a favourable hearing, excused himself on account of the state of public affairs and the distance of Arabia, from personally assisting him, but gave him letters to the nadjash of Ethiopia.[3]

The Abyssinian king, who was now himself a Christian, had thus a double incentive to engage vigorously in his war with Hamyar. Dzu Nowass, in pursuing his plans of vengeance, had seized the opportunity when the season of the year was unfavourable to the navigation between Abyssinia and

[1] Johan. As. Ep. p. 22, 39.

[2] Nuweir, p. 82. Tabeir, p. 166. Hamza, p. 38.

[3] Hamza, ib. Nuweir, p. 89.

Arabia.[4] As soon, however, as the season permitted, and the preparations were completed, an army, amounting according to the Arabian writers to seventy thousand men, set sail for the coast of Hamyar, under the command of Aryat, the nephew of the nadjash.[5] The Abyssinian forces were divided into two parts. One division was landed on that coast of Arabia which lies on the Red Sea, and, after having crossed the Tehama, was to have co-operated with the other division, as soon as the latter had effected a landing on the southern coast. This first division, however, perished or was dispersed in crossing the desert. The Arabian king, therefore, who had been making preparations to defend his kingdom against this double attack, when he heard of the disaster which had befallen the first detachment of the Abyssinian army, and was consequently delivered from all apprehensions of danger on that side, turned his attention entirely to the defence of the coast.[6]

The coasts of Arabia and Abyssinia approach each other by degrees, until at the southern extremity of the Red Sea they form a narrow passage, the entrance into the ocean, which from its perilous navigation gained from the Arabian sailors the name of Bab el Mandoub, or the Gate of Tears. The black, lofty, and often fatal shores of the African

[4] Adventante autem hieme quum in nostram regionem Æthiopes contendere nequirent, &c. Jo. As. Ep. p. 24.

[5] Hamza, p. 38. Nuweir, p. 82. Tabeir, p. 108. Mesoud, p. 140.

[6] Metaphrast.

side were looked on with terror, and formed a bay which was named the Harbour of Death; and from its rocky extremity, Cape Gardafui, or the Cape of Burials, the spirit of the storm was believed to enjoy the last screams of the sinking mariner. The straits are at present scarcely three miles broad;[1] but according to the Arabian geographer, in his time, the sea was there so narrow that from one side a person might be recognized on the opposite shore;[2] and at the period of the expedition under Aryat, it is reported to have been no more than two stadia, or a quarter of a Roman mile, and to have been difficult to pass on account of the rocks that lay concealed beneath the waves.[3] Through this narrow passage the Abyssinian fleet had to sail, before it could reach the coast of Hamyar, and it was the plan of Dzu Nowass to render it impassable. For this purpose, he is said to have thrown across the least dangerous part a heavy chain of iron, held firm by fragments of rock, to which it was fixed, and which were sunk in the

[1] Lord Valentia, Travels. The breadth is here estimated from the Arabian coast to the small barren island of Perim, called by Arrian *Diodorus*. This narrow passage is the only one navigators can pass, as between the island and Africa are innumerable dangerous and small islands. The passage is even now difficult.

[2] Georg. Arabs, Clim. i. p. 6. ap. Bochart.

[3] Itaque considerans angustissimum esse fretum quod est inter Æthiopes et Homeritas, neque superare latitudine duorum stadiorum, et alioqui habere etiam saxa multis in locis latentia. Metaphrastes.

sea, and raised to the surface by masses of timber. After having taken these precautions, Dzu Nowass encamped with his army on the coast where he expected that the Abyssinians, when they found the passage of the straits impossible, would attempt to disembark.

When the Abyssinian fleet approached the straits, ten ships were sent before to reconnoitre the passage, which, being ignorant of the stratagem of the king of Hamyar, and assisted by a favourable wind, entered unexpectedly the narrowest part, and almost by a miracle passed in safety. The rest were obliged, as Dzu Nowass had expected, to return. The ten ships which had passed the straits approached the shore, and would have landed at a place about two hundred stadia or twenty-five miles from that in which the army of Hamyar was posted, but they were prevented by the missiles of the few Arabians who had been sent to defend the southern coast. In another attempt, seven of the remaining ships, in one of which was the Abyssinian commander, succeeded in passing the straits and joining them. The rest of the fleet, which was the more numerous portion, afterwards followed them, and proceeding farther along the coast, cast anchor at a different place, a considerable distance from the former. Dzu Nowass, who naturally expected that the chief commander was with the larger division, proceeded with his army to hinder their landing, leaving a small force to oppose those ships which had first passed the

straits. Aryat, constrained by want of provisions, was not long before he attempted to effect a landing. According to the Arabian accounts the Abyssinians disembarked near the port of Aden. Their commander wished them to consider their safety as entirely depending on their bravery, and, having ordered the ships to be set on fire, he addressed them in a few words: "O men of Abyssinia, before you are your enemies, behind you the sea: your choice is death or victory."[1] The contest was short but obstinate, the Hamyarites were entirely defeated, and Aryat hastened towards the metropolis, the city of Taphar or Dhaphar, which being unprepared for a siege immediately surrendered to him.[2]

When the king of Hamyar heard of the fall of his capital, astonished at the unexpected success of his enemies, and now threatened by them on every side, his resolution entirely failed him; so that, when the Abyssinians landed from the other ships, they soon defeated the Arabians, who wanted spirit and concert to make an effective resistance, and Dzu

1 Nuweir, p. 82.

2 Metaphrast. Jo. As. Ep. p. 42, 43. Procopius; Malala; &c. Arabic authorities: Nuweir, p. 82; Hamza, p. 42; Tabeir, p. 106, 108; Mesoud, p. 140. On the history of Arethas and the events which followed, the reader may consult Walch, Historia Rerum in Homeritide, and the review of it in the Orientalische und Exegetische Bibliothek of Michaelis, band 7. p. 142. The Greek writers say that the nadjash accompanied the expedition. I have followed the Arabians: but it is a matter not worth disputing.

Nowass himself was amongst the number of the slain. The native historians give a different account of the death of the tobbaa. According to them, he fled from the field of battle, after he had witnessed the defeat of his army, but being closely pursued, and at last hemmed in between his enemies and the sea, he precipitated himself from a rock, and perished in the waves. By this action the fate of Arabia was decided. In Dzu Dgiadan, who was the successor of Dzu Nowass, and who fell in opposing the conquerors, ended the race of Hamyar.[3] Yaman became a province dependent on the Abyssinian nadjash, and Aryat, known to the Greeks under the name of Esimiphæus, ascended the throne as his tributary.[4]

The spirit of Christianity is mild and forgiving, and its doctrines inculcate the duty of forbearance and long-suffering; but in the barbarous times which marked the decline of the Roman empire, and among the wild tribes, such as those of Arabia and Abyssinia, who became converts, a different spirit had usurped its place. As the partizans of Christianity, moreover, increased in power, they unfortunately became too often, like their enemies, vindictive and persecuting. This change was not caused by their religion, but by the state of the times, by the character of those who embraced it, and by the different and contending doctrines that were mixed with it.

[3] Hamza, p. 34. Abulfeda, p. 10.

[4] Procopius de Bel. Pers. lib. i. c. 30, who calls him a Christian and an Hamyarite.

The first step of the Christian conquerors of Arabia, was to revenge the massacre of Nadjran on its perpetrators; and the same persecution, which had before raged against the believers, fell on the heads of the offending Jews, until the fertile tracts of Hamyar presented a continued scene of bloodshed and devastation. The churches which had been destroyed by Dzu Nowass, were all by degrees rebuilt, and new bishops and priests appointed by the Alexandrian primate.[1]

[1] Metaphrast. Jo. As. Ep. p. 43.

SECTION V.

THE northern Arabs of Syria and Irak were subject to the two independent princes of Ghassan and Hirah, the dominions of the latter including the tribes who were nominally subject to the kingdom of Persia, the former those who occupied the districts bordering on Syria, Mesopotamia, and Egypt. The family of the kings of Hirah appears to have originated from some of the chiefs who had accompanied the warlike expeditions of the tobbaas of Hamyar into Sogd and Persia.[2] The first king of Hirah, called by the historians simply Malek, who is said to have been a descendant of Kahlan, mounted the throne soon after the death of Alexander,[3] but on the death of his nephew Jodhaimah, the third king of that dynasty, the crown was seized by the sons of Lachm, a descendant of Saba.[4] The capital of Malek was called Anbar, but Jodhaimah, who had by his conquests extended the boundaries of his kingdom,[5] moved the seat of

[2] Hamza, in Rasmussin, Hist. Præcip. Arab. Regn. p. 3. The family of Hirah are said to have migrated into Irak, according to Mesoud, at the time of the flood of Elarim. Hirah was before occupied by Arabs of Ghassan. Mesoud, in Schultens' ed. p. 180.

[3] Pococke, Spec. Hist. Arab. p. 67. [4] Id. p. 69.

[5] Hamza, in Rasmussin, p. 4, 5, 6. He is said to have invaded Syria and killed Amrus, king of the Amalekites, p. 4.

government to Hirah, which had been built by one of the tobbaas, who stopped there on his road to Irak.[1] The kings of Ghassan deduced their descent from the tribe of Azd in Yaman.[2] Gafahah, the first king, had dispossessed the original dynasty, and is said to have been confirmed in his conquest by the Roman governor of Syria.[3] The third king Tsâlabuh, built Akhah, in the Hauraun, towards Balka, the latter of which was the capital of Ghassan in the time of the second Hareth, but the seat of government was removed to Sideir, by Amrú, the twelfth king of this dynasty.[4]

Although by eastern writers the name of Syria is given to the whole of the territory between the Mediterranean and the Euphrates as far as Babylon,[5] yet all the tract which spreads out to the east

[1] Abulfedæ Irak, in Büschings Magazin für die neue Historie und Geographie, band iv. p. 257.

[2] Pococke, p. 77. Hamza, in Rasm. p. 41.

[3] Hamza, ib. p. 42.

[4] Hamza, p. 44. The capital of the kings of Ghassan is generally considered to have been Petra, the magnificent ruins of which were explored by Irby, Mangles, and Bankes. But the Arab kings appear to have seldom been long in one place; and as being nearer to the frontiers of the neighbouring states, into which they were continually making excursions, they might prefer to reside at Balka, or Sideir, or Tadmor.

[5] Maimonides describes Syria as consisting of the country—"from Israel and below it to *Aram Naharim*—ארם נהרים [Aram of the Rivers, *i.e.* Mesopotamia] and *Aram Isoba*—ארם ישובא [the northern part of Syria towards Aleppo], and the whole tract of the Euphrates as far as Babel—

of Libanus and the Jordan belongs physically to Arabia,[6] and we find accordingly that it was always occupied by wandering tribes, who continually infested the border districts of Syria, whilst that country was subject either to native princes or foreign conquerors.[7] The interior has always been a sterile sandy desert, interspersed however by frequent green and fertile oases, which were occupied by villages and small towns, as was the case with Palmyra, which rose to power and opulence by being the centre of the trade from the Persian gulf.[8] On the east the Arabs were often in possession of the rich plains of the Hauran and Damascus; towards the north the districts of Edessa and Emessa, as well as Irak and part of Mesopotamia towards the east, were long ruled by Arabian dynasties.

The Arabs of the northern desert, during the revolution of centuries, have changed little more than their religion. Distinguished from all their neighbours by their sinewy limbs, and their dark and

כל יד פרת עד בבל—as Damascus and Achleb (Aleppo) and Haran or Charan, and Magbub (Mabog) כגון דמשק ואחלב וחרן ומגבב—and the like, to Schinear שנער and Tzohor (וצהר)—הרי היא כסוריים behold it is Syria." Hilch. Tzum. c. 1. p. 9.

[6] In Xenophon's time Mesopotamia seems to have been included under the name of Arabia: while under the lower empire Arabia reached to Nisibis, εξεπεμπετο δε και ες την Νισιβιν, την τεσυγχορον Αραβιαν. Theophylact. Symocatt. lib. v. c. 1.

[7] Appian, Syriaca, c. 51. [8] Appian, Civil. lib. v. c. 9.

fiery eye, they roved in the conscious pride of personal independence, with "no dwelling but the tent, no intrenchment but the sword, no law but the traditionary song of their bards."[1] The virtues of the Scenite were bravery, generosity, and hospitality; and he looked, as he still does, with contempt and indignation on the faithlessness and treachery which were too often the characteristics of his more polished neighbours.[2] But his virtues were more than overbalanced by his lawless and predatory life, his avarice, and his cruelty. The love of the Arabs for independence, placed them under the necessity of being continually in a posture of defence; by their perpetual hostilities they learnt to consider every one as their enemy, and one of their poets has justified their mode of life, by observing, that "he who drives not invaders from his cistern with strong arms, will see it demolished; and he who abstains ever so much from injuring others, will often himself be injured."[3] Their liberty thus became a precarious possession; for they were at every step in danger from their enemies, and every person and every place aroused their suspicious fears.[4] Plunder, much more

[1] Scenes and Impressions.

[2] "The term *khayn*, treacherous, is universally applied to every Turk in Arabia, with that proud self-confidence of superiority, in this respect, for which the Arabs are deservedly renowned." Burckhardt, Travels in Arabia, vol. i. p. 39.

[3] Zohair, Moallaca, couplet 53.

[4] "He ascends the sandy hillock of Thalbut, and explores

even than revenge, was generally the cause of their wars, however the greatest heroes might boast of being "impetuous in the battle, but regardless of the spoils."[5]

The Arabs were long independent of the neighbouring empires of Persia and Rome. They fought under the banners of the great king as early as the age of Alexander, whose soldiers were often harassed by them in the mountains of Libanus,[6] and the Persian army at the battle of Gaza was partly composed of them.[7] But in succeeding reigns, the richest provinces of Persia were laid waste by the numerous hordes which issued from the desert. At the time of the extinction of the dynasty of the Arsacides by Ardesheir Baubegan (or Artaxerxes), the territories between the Tigris and the Oxus, including Khorasan and Irak, had been for upwards of five centuries in the possession of various tribes of Arabs, under Mûlouk-al-Towâeif,[8] or chiefs of various independent tribes, although several Per-

its deserted top, fearing lest an enemy should lurk behind the guide stones." Zohair, coupl. 27.

[5] Idem, coupl. 47. [6] Curtius, lib. iv. c. 2.

[7] Cecidere Persarum Arabumque circa decem millia, nec Macedonum incruenta victoria fuit. Curt. lib. iv. c. 6.—See Josippon Ben Gorion, Hist. Jud. vol. ii. p. 161. He calls the Arab king who was defeated here by Alexander הרתם *Harethum*.

[8] The history of the Mûlouk-al-Towâeif is given by Masoudi, p. 159, in the Notices et Extraits de la Bibliothèque du Roi, tom. viii.

sian princes had at times made a temporary conquest of Irak, Medaine, and even Rei and Isfahaun. Ardesheir however invaded the territories of the Mûlouk-al-Towâeif, drove them from Khorasan, Irak, and Mesopotamia, and even pursued them into Bahhrein and Hedjaz, where he compelled them to pay tribute to the crown of Persia. Many of the Arab chieftains were permitted to occupy the northern deserts under the princes of Hirah, which with its dependencies the Arabian king of Bahhrein was allowed to retain, and some appear to have retired to Hamyar and other parts of the south. The king of Hirah seems however to have been considered as little better than a viceroy of Persia. The Arabs of Ghassan, and other tribes who bordered on Syria, which was occupied by the Romans, sheltered themselves from the Persian power by a nominal alliance with their neighbours. Accordingly when Hormuz II., the seventh king of the Sassanian dynasty, attempted to exact a tribute of the tribe of Ghassan, they refused to comply with his demand. Without giving them time to seek assistance from their Roman allies, the Persian king invaded their territory, and entirely defeated them. But Hormuz himself was waylaid in the desert by a body of Arabs, who put him and his attendants to the sword.[1]

On the sudden death of Hormuz, the next heir to

[1] Malcolm's History of Persia, vol. i. p. 106, 7, and the authorities cited by him.

the throne of Persia was his posthumous son Shahpoor the second. The minority of this prince presented an opportunity of revenge to the Arabs of Bahhrein and Lachsa, who collected a considerable force, crossed the Persian gulf, and plundered the country in all directions. The king of Hamyar, tobbaa Hassan, incited perhaps by the fugitive chiefs who had been driven from their possessions by Shahpoor, and who had sought refuge in Yaman, at the same time made a descent on Irak. No sooner, however, had Shahpoor reached the age of sixteen, than he prepared to retaliate on the Arabs the cruelties which they had perpetrated on his subjects. His vengeance was first directed against those tribes who had gained possession of Fars, which had been the principal scene of their devastations. Not one was suffered to escape, and the captives had their shoulders pierced, and afterwards dislocated by means of a string passed through them, a punishment which gained for this Persian king the title of *Dzu Lektaf*, or lord of the shoulders. Shahpoor next crossed the gulf, marched through the desert as far as Yatreb, filling up all the wells, and massacring every Arab he met with. From Hedjaz he continued his destructive march into Palestine and Syria, and to Mesopotamia and Irak, where he fixed his residence at the cities of Ctesiphon and Seleucia, which, separated by the Tigris, were denominated by the Arabians Al Medaïm, or the two cities.[2] Whilst

[2] Nikbi ben Massoud, p. 329—333, in the Notices de la Bibl. du Roi, tom. ii.

Shahpoor was engaged in quelling a rebellion which had arisen in Khorasan, the Arabs invaded Mesopotamia, and a chief of the name of Manizen, or Malek Zeiren, seized on the almost impregnable fortress of Khadher or Khazm, near Tekrit, where he defied the power of the Persian army. The daughter of the Arabian chief is said to have fallen in love with Shahpoor, whom she had seen from the ramparts, and she found means to disclose to him her passion, offering to betray the fortress into his hands, on his promise to become her husband. The condition was accepted, Manizen and the garrison were massacred, his daughter for one night shared the bed of the conqueror, and the next morning she was tied by her beautiful hair to the tail of a wild horse, which was let loose in the desert.[1]

The Syrian Arabs were first subjected to Rome by the arms of Pompey.[2] The kingdom of Arethas at that time included Petra and Cœlosyria, as well as Damascus;[3] he had been the ally of Antipater, and had besieged Aristobulus in Jerusalem, and taken the city all but the temple, when he was

[1] Eutychius, Annal. ed. Seld. tom. i. p. 369. The history of Manizen is given by Malcolm (Hist. of Pers. vol. i. p. 97), from the *Kozut ul Suffa*, and by Major D. Price (Essay towards the history of Arabia), from the *Tarikh Tebry*.

[2] Dio Cassius, Hist. lib. xxxvi. p. 360. Appian, Mithridatica, c. 106, 117. Jo. Malala, p. 288. They afterwards fought on the side of their conqueror. Appian, Civil. lib. ii. c. 71.

[3] Frœlich, Annales Regum Syriæ. Josephus. Frœlich has engraved two coins of Arethas, on one of which he bears the title of ΦΙΛΕΛΛΗΝΟΣ, tab. xvi.

obliged to retire before the Roman forces.[4] The history of the eastern frontiers of the Roman empire does not rise to much importance till after the removal of the imperial residence to Byzantium, for the dominions of Rome and Persia were separated by the possessions of various independent princes, such as those of Palmyra, Edessa, &c., whom the policy established by Augustus had suffered to reign without interruption. On the death of Pertinax, these independent princes favoured the cause of Pescennius Niger, the Syrian governor, who aspired to the imperial purple. After his defeat they incurred the resentment of the conqueror, and Severus overran and subjected with his victorious army the whole of the country from Armenia, Osrhoëne, and the Persian frontiers, where he took Ctesiphon and Babylon, to the limits of the happy Arabia.[5] The Arabs of Syria still, however, preserved their independence, and in later times, on the defeat of Valerian, the victorious army of Shahpoor was driven from Mesopotamia by the Palmyrene Arabs under Odenathus.[6] The wife and successor of Odenathus was the celebrated Zenobia, and on her defeat by

[4] Appian. Mithridat. c. 106, 117. Josephus, Antiq. lib. xiv. c. 1, 2. Josippon, Hist. Jud. lib. v. c. 38. p. 174, 5. Noldii Historia Idumæa, in Havercamp's Josephus, p. 338. tom. ii. 2 Maccab. v. 8, &c. His granddaughter was married to Herod Antipas.

[5] Herodian, lib. iii. c. 27. Zozimus, lib. i. p. 10. διαδραμων δε τους Σκηνιτας Αραβας, και πασαν Αραβιαν καταστρεψαμενος.

[6] Zosimus, lib. i. p. 36.

Aurelian, Palmyra and its dependencies became permanently a province of the empire.

After the death of Constantine the tranquillity of the eastern empire was again disturbed by the hostilities of the Persians, and the most important fortresses of Mesopotamia were reduced by the arms of Shahpoor. The Arabs of Syria had suffered severely from the Persians, who in pursuing the Arabs had been stopped only by the shores of the Mediterranean, and they willingly attended the expedition of Julian, whose army was considerably increased by their numbers,[1] and who was liberal in rewarding them for their services.[2] At this period we read of Saracens, or Arabs, who attended the Persian army,[3] and who were employed in harassing Jovian in his retreat.[4] From the time of Baharam Gaur, who had been educated amongst the Arabs, and raised to the throne by their assistance, the princes of the house of Hirah were in great favour with the Persian monarchs.[5]

Christianity was introduced at an early period

[1] Adscitis Saracenorum auxiliis, quæ animis obtulere promptissimis, &c. Ammianus Marcellinus, lib. xxiii. c. 5. Conf. Malcolm, Hist. of Pers. vol. i. p. 109.

[2] Post quæ Saraceni procursatores quosdam parte hostium obtuleri lætissimo principi, et munerati ad agenda similia sunt remissi. Id. lib. xxiv. c. 1.

[3] Ammianus, lib. xxiv. c. 2. [4] Id. lib. xxv. c. 6, 8.

[5] D'Herbelot, Biblioth. Orient. art. *Baharam*. Eutychius, tom. ii. p. 82. Nikbi ben Massoud, p. 335. (Not. de la Bibl. du Roi, tom. ii.)

among the Roman Arabs. There were Arabians present at the feast of Pentecost,[6] and St. Paul resided some time in the dominions of the Arabian king Hareth, or Arethas, whose territory included the city of Damascus.[7] Agbarus, so celebrated in the annals of the early Christians, was a prince of the territory of Edessa,[8] and Christianity had made some progress in the desert in the time of Arnobius.[9] Bishops of Bostra (Basra), which was considered as an Arabian town, are mentioned in early records.[10] The tribe of Ghassan was celebrated for its early attachment to the Christian faith;[11] and during the

[6] Acts ii. 11. [7] Acts ix. 25. 2 Cor. xi. 33.

[8] Bayer, Historia Asrhoena et Edessena, p. 105. Moses Choren. Hist. Armen. lib. i. c. 29. See also Eusebius and the Eccl. Historians.

[9] Arnobius, adv. Gentes, lib. 2. p. 50.

[10] See Fabricius, Lux. Evangel. p. 693. Buchanan's Christian Researches. At the Nicene council were present six bishops of the province of Arabia, the bishops of Bostra, Philadelphia, of the Jabrudi, Sodomi, of Betharma, and Dionysias (Concil. tom. i. p. 27); of the province of Phœnicia, bordering on Arabia, the bishops of Damascus, Palmyra, Emessa, &c.; of Cœlosyria, the bishops of Antioch, Apamea, Rhaphanea, Hierapolis, Gabala, Zeugma, (orBirtha,) Gindara, (Jindartz,) Acoraba, Germanicia, &c.; of Mesopotamia, the bishops of Edessa, Nisibis, &c. (p. 27.) At the first Constantinopolitan council were bishops of the following sees—Provinciæ Bostron, Dionysia, Adrana, Constantia, Neapolis; Provinciæ Osdroënæ, Edessa, Carræ, Bathna; in Mesopotamia, Amida, Constantina, Imeria.

[11] Ibn Kothaib, ap. Eichhorn, Monument. Antiq. Hist. Arab. p. 150.

short reign of the emperor Philip, Arabia was noted as the mother of a dangerous heresy, which taught that the souls expired and suffered corruption with the body, and that at the general resurrection both would be revived together.[1]

The name of Mavia (Muaviyah), an Arab queen, is celebrated amongst ecclesiastical writers. The Saracens had been for some time, under this queen, the scourge of the Syrian frontier, and their hostilities were only arrested by her conversion; Mavia accepted at the same time the alliance of Rome, and a Christian bishop named Moses, ordained by the primate of Alexandria.[2] In the war with the Goths, who had carried their arms to the walls of Constantinople, the courage of the Saracen auxiliaries was soon after exhibited in the defence of the capital, and the wild hordes who had depopulated the fields of Thrace, were obliged to yield to the no less barbarous bravery of the Arabs, in a sally from one of the gates of the city.[3] The progress of Christianity increased in proportion as the Arabs became more intimately connected with the Romans, the cities and towns were by degrees furnished with Syrian

[1] The *Arabian* heretics and the Manichæi arose in the third century. Hottinger. Hist. Eccl. tom. i. p. 145.

[2] Theodoret. Ruffinus. Socrates. Pagi, p. 391. The conversion of Mavia took place about A.D. 372; Christianity had been introduced among the southern Saracens before that period. Baronius, tom. v. p. 393.

[3] Socrates, lib. v. c. 1. Sozomen, lib. vii. c. 1. Ammianus, lib. xxxi. c. 16.

and native bishops, and the country took the form, or title, of a Roman eparchy.[4]

To the Byzantine court, however, the Arabs were rather allies than slaves. Their governors were generally natives, and were named *phylarchs*, or leaders of tribes, while the provinces of Syria and Mesopotamia were governed by magistrates named *duces*.[5] Towards the east the territory of the Arabian phylarchs joined the dominions of the kings of Hirah, who were now subject to the Persian king. Thus the northern Arabs, who began to be known under the name of Saracens, were nearly equally divided between the two hostile powers of Rome and Persia, and a declaration of war on either side was almost immediately followed by an invasion by the flying squadrons of one or other of the Arabian kings. Early in the fifth century the dissensions between the rival chiefs had been publicly manifested, and the mondar Naaman, was easily induced by a bribe from the king of Persia to invade the Roman territory.[6] The idolatrous inhabitants of Beth-Hur were visited with all the miseries of a successful

[4] Επαρχια Αραβιας. ὑπο κονσουλαριον. Hieroclis Synecdemus, p. 50, apud Bandurin. Imperium Orientale.

[5] Φυλαρχοι—Δουκας, Procop. de Bel. Pers. c. 17. p. 51. Appian calls Agbarus king of Edessa, an Arabian phylarch—Ακβαρον φυλαρχον Αραβων. Φυλαρχης, says Suidas, ὁ δυναστης ξυμβαλλει τῳ Τραϊανῳ. περι Ακβαρου, ὁς ην Οσροηνης χωρας δυναστης οὐσπερ φυλαρχας σνομαζουσιν εκεινοι. ὁτι και τα χωρια αυτων φυλαι ονομαζουσιν εκεινοι.

[6] Assemann, Biblioth. Orient. tom. i. p. 227.

siege from the rapacious Arabs.[1] Kobad himself, at the head of a powerful army of Persians and Huns, quickly followed the Arabian chief, and laid siege to the city of Amida, now Dyar-bekr. In his besieging camp he was visited by the ambassador of Anastasius, who had stooped to solicit the departure of his enemy from the Roman territory by the offer of a large sum of money. The ambassador was retained by Kobad, the siege of Amida pursued with vigour, and the Arabs sent to invade and lay waste the districts of Haran, where they carried their incursions to the walls of Constantina, or Tela. They were then at first successfully opposed by the united exertions of Olympius and Eugenius, the governors of Tela and Melitena, but in a second engagement the few troops these officers had collected to defend the Syrian frontier were unequal to the united strength of Arabian, Persian, and Hun, and their defeat laid open to the fury of the enemy the whole country up to the walls of Edessa.[2]

During a short and precarious peace, or rather cessation of arms, which appears to have been pur-

[1] S. Isaac Magnus, who was contemporary with the fall of Beth-Hur, represents the destruction of its inhabitants as the punishment which they had drawn down on themselves by their idolatry, worshipping Venus, the common deity of the Arabian tribes, and equalling in wickedness the people of Nisibis and Haran, who had fallen off to the Persian superstitions. Ap. Assemann. tom. i. p. 225.

[2] Jo. Stylites, ap. Assemann. tom. i. p. 273-4.

chased by the promise of the evacuation of Amida by the Romans, an opportunity was afforded of friendly congress between the Christians and the Persian Saracens. The Persian monarchs, from Shahpoor to Kobad, had persecuted with unrelenting acrimony the followers of Christ, and the spirit of the monarch was easily imparted to his vassals and the kings who courted his alliance. The pious example and eloquent exhortations of Simeon Stylites, a Syrian monk, had induced numbers of the Saracen tribes to embrace the religion of their Saviour, and Naaman began to fear lest his subjects might be led by their religion to desert to the service of the Romans. The intercourse of the Arabs with the Christians was therefore forbidden on pain of instant death. But, in consequence of a vision or dream, the edict of the Arabian chief was soon afterwards recalled, and free liberty given to attend the lectures of Simeon. Naaman confessed to Antiochus, the Roman governor of Damascus, at a friendly interview in the Arabian camp, which was then fixed in that neighbourhood, that the night after he had issued the command, whilst he was sleeping in his tent, he was startled by the appearance of a venerable man of a commanding mien, accompanied by five attendants. Approaching the chief, who, terrified at the extraordinary appearance, had fallen almost senseless at his feet, he addressed him in an indignant tone, "Darest thou, wretch, to persecute the people of God?" The Arabian chief was then

laid across his bed by the attendants, and scourged almost to death. He was at last released from this unpleasant situation by the order of the principal personage, who stood before him with a naked sword in his hand, and threatened that unless he immediately recalled his edict against the Christians, himself and his family should be by that sword severed member from member. Naaman himself was only prevented from embracing Christianity by his fear of the Persian king.[1] When the change of sentiment that had taken place in their prince was publicly known, the Saracens flocked in crowds to receive the Christian faith, changing the worship of their idols for the divine institutes of the Gospel.[2]

Shortly afterwards, the emperor being unwilling to accede to the demands of the Persians, the war was again renewed. The Persian Arabs, having invaded the Roman territory, were expelled by Timostratus, one of the Syrian leaders. The do-

[1] Cosmas Presbyter, ap. Assemann. tom. i. p. 247. Enimvero ex ea pavore et acerrima fustigatione consequutus morbus me ultra mensem tenuit. Perhaps this was an addition of the writer. The work of Cosmas is published in Assemanni Acta Martyr, Oriental. tom. ii.

[2] Ismaelitæ autem turmatim venientes, ducenti simul, et trecenti, ac interdum mille, patrium errorem magna voce abnegant, simulacra quæ colucrunt coram magno illo lumine conterentes, Venerisque orgia ejurantes (hujus quippe dæmonis cultum amplexi jam olim fuerant) divinis mysteriis iniantur, leges ab illa sacra lingua accipientes, &c. Theodoret, cited by Asseman. Conf. Vit. Sim. Styl. p. 328.

minions of Naaman were laid waste and plundered by the Arabian allies of Rome, and himself compelled to seek shelter in the desert; from thence he fled into Persia, and joined the forces of the great king. Enraged at his defeat he used all his interest to persuade Kobad to turn his arms against Syria. But in a conflict between the Persians and Romans under Fabricius, the Arab chief received a dangerous wound on his head, which he only survived a few days, dying before the expedition against Edessa set out. Kobad, having placed a new king over the Arabians, proceeded to Tela, which, being obstinately defended, he left, and went on to Edessa, fixing his camp for twenty days on the river Galabus (the modern Jálâb). From Edessa he led his army against the city of Haran, but the citizens, in a sudden attack on the besiegers, made a great slaughter of the Arabs, and took prisoner the leader of the Huns, who was released on the promise of the Persian monarch to raise the siege. Kobad returned to continue the siege of Edessa, which had been reinforced by supplies under Patricciolus.[3]

Amongst the first monks who were active in

[3] Jo. Stylites, ap. Asseman. tom. i. p. 276-8. Bayer, Historia Osrhoëna, p. 242, &c. The people of Haran, or Carræ, Procopius tells us, went to the Persians with rich presents, but they were restored, and the people of Haran were left unmolested, ὁτι δη οἱ πλειστοι ου Χριστιανοι, αλλα δοξης της παλαιας τυγχανουσιν οντες. Procopius, cited by Bayer, p. 255.

converting the wandering tribes, the name of Euthymius is recorded. The fierce persecution which raged in Persia against the Christians in the reigns of Yezdigird and his successor Baharam, during nearly twenty years of the commencement of the fifth century, is said to have originated from the zeal of a Christian bishop, who had destroyed a pyreum, or temple of the Persian fire-worshippers.[1] Amongst those who suffered under it are preserved the names and histories of Maharsapor[2] and St. Jacobus.[3] For the more effectual extirpation of their enemies, the Magi had instigated Yezdigird to appoint the various Arabian phylarchs who served under him as guards between the frontiers of Persia and Rome, that their flying parties might surprise and cut off the fugitives. Many of the Christians, however, escaped by the roads that were guarded by the phylarch Aspebetus, who, pitying their misfortunes, assisted instead of impeding their flight. The Magi, informed of his proceedings, accused him before the king, and Aspebetus, rather than trust to the mercy of Yezdigird, fled with his family to seek protection in Syria, and met with a hospitable recep-

[1] Asseman. Acta Martyrum Orient. tom. i. p. 230, 1, 2. The following distich was the work of some pious monk:—

Εις πυρσολατρων γην εναθλει Περσιδα
Ἡ Χριστολατρων αυχενοτμητος φαλαγξ.

Menæa ap. Assem. p. 132.

[2] Asseman. ib. p. 234.

[3] Id. ib. p. 242.

tion from Anatolius, the prefect of the east, who restored him to the same rank under the emperor which he had before held under his enemies.[4] The monks appear to have been in some measure the physicians of the desert;[5] Euthymius in this capacity had been serviceable to the family of the Arab, and, actuated by gratitude and by the convincing persuasions of the pious monk, he embraced the belief in the Redeemer.[6] The whole of his family were also baptized, and their example was followed by numbers of the wandering tribes.[7] Aspebetus himself embraced a monastic life, and left the command of his tribe to his son Terebon. Afterwards, the same Aspebetus, whose name at his baptism had been changed to Peter, was consecrated by Juvenal patriarch of Jerusalem, and became the first bishop of the wandering tribes in the neighbourhood of Palestine. The name of Peter soon became famous through the desert, and the Saracen wanderers, flocking in crowds to receive the rite of baptism at

[4] Vita Euthymii, in Cotelier, Monument. Ecclesiast. tom. i. p. 46.

[5] The most numerous of the miracles of the Christian monks were those of curing the sick. S. Simeon Stylites was particularly celebrated on this account. (Cosmas, Vit. S. Simeonis, in Asseman. Act. Mart. tom. ii. p. 346.) The monks in all countries and ages were noted for their knowledge of the virtues of herbs.

[6] Euthymii Vit. p. 218. [7] Id. p. 221.

his hands, are compared to a river that flows on with a constant, never-failing stream.[1]

Simeon, who, from the mode of life in which he is said to have passed part of his days, was named Stylites,[2] was by birth an Arab,[3] and was initiated into the monastic life by Maras, bishop of Gabala.[4] His name was famous even among the Sabæans of Yaman[5] and his friendship was courted by the Arabian chiefs.[6] Amongst the number of his converts were the idolatrous inhabitants of the mountains of Libanus;[7] the Christians of Arabia were supported and increased by his miracles and his eloquence, and it was his boast that they were respected equally by the wandering robber and the ferocious wild beast.[8]

[1] *Πετρος μεν ουν ουτως επισκοπος των παρεμβολον εν* Παλαιστινη *πρωτος χειροτονειται. ἡ δε των Σαρακηνων πληθυς, ισα και ποταμων ρευμασιν ἀενναων επερρει· και οἱ νυν προσιοντες, τοις φθασισι προσετιθεντο· και ουτοι παντες τῃ σφραγιδι του βαπτισματος σημειουμενοι, τῃ των Χριστιανων ποιμνῃ συνηριθμουντο.* Euthymii Vit. p. 231.

[2] Simeon, we are told, stood upright on a column twenty-two cubits high, for five years. Cosmas, Acta S. Simeonis, in Asseman. Acta Martyr. Orient. tom. ii. p. 365.

[3] In regionis Nachipelorum vico, quem Sisan adpellant, in Arabia natus. Acta S. Simeon. p. 261.

[4] The Kalaba of Procopius; the remains of the castle exist on the banks of the Jáláb.

[5] Acta S. Simeon, pp. 278, 347. [6] Id. p. 345.

[7] Acta S. Simeon, p. 320-323.

[8] Nec Arabum latronum nos quisquam offendit, nec bestia

When he died, he left the orphan and the widow to mourn the loss of a friend.[9]

St. Saba, who was one of the acquaintances of Euthymius' latter days,[10] is celebrated amongst the Syrian Christians as the "Star of Palestine," and is eulogized as the colonizer of the desert, by turning its barren sands into flourishing towns.[11] From his solitary cell near the Jordan, his name was known far around as the friend of the unfortu-

nobis nocuit, &c. Id. p. 347. Sudden and miraculous punishments were often, according to the legends, the consequence of injuring the faithful believers. The following is an instance: "Gerontius, abbot of the monastery of our holy father Euthymius, related to me, saying: We were three, seeking provisions beyond the Dead Sea, near Besimus. And as we were ascending a mountain, another was walking below us on the shore of the sea, and it happened that the Saracens, who were wandering about those parts, met with him. After therefore they had passed him, one of the Saracens returned, and cut off the head of the anchorite, whilst we were looking at them, for we were on the mountain. And as we were weeping for the anchorite, behold on a sudden a large bird made a stoop at the Saracen, carried him up into the air, and then let him fall to the ground, where he was dashed to pieces." Mosci Pratus Spiritualis, in Cotelier, tom. i. p. 346. A miracle of the same kind is related in the life of S. Saba (p. 237), more wonderful, and consequently still less credible.

9 Acta S. Simeon. p. 385.

10 Cyril. Scythopolit. Vita S. Sabæ, in Cotelier. Saba was by birth a Cappadocian. Id. p. 222.

11 Saba eximius ille qui desertum nostrum in urbes convertit, ipsumque habitari fecit, qui est Palestinæ Stella. Eutychius, ed. Seld. p. 137.

nate. When he first entered the desert to seek retirement, he met some hungry Arabs, who were reduced almost to starvation, and he gave them freely what he had to satisfy their wants; from that hour his cell was always furnished with abundance by the grateful Scenites, and in contemplating their officious kindness, he wept over the ingratitude of his fellow-creatures towards the Giver of all things.[1] His name afforded protection to the numerous eremites who had established themselves in the wilderness, and in the midst of continual scenes of bloodshed and rapine, the pious and defenceless inhabitant of the solitary cave was suffered to live uninjured and unmolested.[2]

Soon after the accession of Justinian, owing to a quarrel with the governor of Palestine, Diomedes Silentiarius, the Arabian phylarch or king, Hareth, retired into the desert, where he was suddenly attacked, defeated, and slain by the king of the Persian Arabs, who had, during the reign of Justin, been in continual hostilities with the Romans.[3] To revenge his death, by order of the emperor, the successor of Hareth, who also bore his name, and was

[1] Ὁ δε πατηρ ημων Σαβας την των βαρβαρων ενγνωμοσυνην θαυμασας και κατανυγεις, ελεγε μετα δακρυων. κ. τ. λ. Cyril. Vit. S. Sabæ, p. 236.

[2] Id. ib. p. 323. Among the Arabs converted by Saba were the inhabitants of Medaba, a town of Arabia, beyond the Jordan: p. 290.

[3] Barhebræus, sive Abulfaragii Hist. Dynast. (Syriac.) p. 82.

probably his son, was joined by the governors of Phœnicia and Mesopotamia, in the invasion of Hirah, and the mondar was compelled to fly and leave his dominions to the mercy of his enemies.[4] But the dissensions of the two Arab princes were seldom at rest, and as they had not been included in the articles of peace between Rome and Persia, they were now waging a constant war. In one of their disputes the king of Hirah, as well as a son of the king of Ghassan, fell.[5]

The invasion of Mesopotamia and Syria by Kobad, in the beginning of the reign of Justinian, was undertaken at the instigation of the king of Hirah, in whom the king of Persia placed unbounded confidence.[6] The Persian army was preceded by the Saracens, who were opposed in vain by the king of Ghassan.[7] The Arabs were quickly followed by Kobad himself, who was as closely watched by Belisarius, but either by the treachery or cowardice of Hareth, the king of the Arabs of Ghassan, the Romans were defeated.[8]

[4] Jo. Malala, pars altera, p. 165.

[5] Barhebræus, Hist. Dynast. p. 86.

[6] Procop. de Bell. Pers. lib. i. c. 17. p. 50. *Αλαμουνδαρος μεν βασιλεως αξιωμα εχων απαντων μονος των εν Περσαις Σαρακηνων ειχε την αρχην.*

[7] Procop. ib. p. 51.

[8] Id. c. 18. p. 52.

SECTION VI.

THE revolution in southern Arabia was agreeable to Justinian on more accounts than one; for, though the conquest of Yaman might be regarded as the triumph of Christianity over its opponents, he hoped to reap more solid advantages from the friendly professions of the conquerors. In the sanguinary wars with the Persian monarch the Arabs of the Syrian frontiers had been faithful and effective allies. By an alliance with the kings of Abyssinia and Hamyar, he might, if necessary, call off the attentions of the Persians to another quarter. A simultaneous attack of the Hamyarites in Irak, and of the Romans and their more northern allies in Mesopotamia, would have divided and weakened their strength.

One of the most necessary luxuries of the Byzantine court was the silken produce of the worms of Serica or China. The value of this merchandise was sufficient to induce the caravans to consume a period of two hundred and forty days in traversing the interior of Asia from Syria to China.[1] But the trade in silk and the commodities of the east was

1 On the silk trade, consult Gibbon, Decline and Fall, c. xl. and Procopius, c. 20.

now entirely monopolised by the Persian merchants; during hostilities the supply was necessarily stopped, and in time of peace the emperor beheld with grief the wealth of Rome passing into the hands of its enemies. By a coincidence of commercial interests he hoped to turn the trade of India and China into its ancient course, through the hands of the merchants of Hamyar and Adulis.

An embassy to Auxuma and Hamyar was conducted by Nonnosus,[2] who ascended the Nile from Alexandria, crossed the Red Sea,[3] and landed on the Arabian coast, where he visited the district occupied by the tribes of Maad and Kendah, which were then ruled by Kaisus, or Amru'l Keis,[4] and were tributary to Hamyar.[5] Kaisus willingly contracted an alliance with the emperor, and delivered his son Mavia to the Romans as a hostage.[6] He afterwards joined the other Saracens in the invasion[7]

[2] Photius, Biblioth. cod. iii. p. 6. The grandfather of Nonnosus had been employed as ambassador to the king of Kendah, and his father had been sent on an embassy to the mondar, to negociate the delivery of prisoners. Nonnosus published an account of his travels in Arabia and Abyssinia during the embassy.

[3] Jo. Malala, pars altera, p. 193.

[4] Photius, cod. iii. Procopius de Bel. Pers. c. 19.—Μααδδηνοι—Χινδινων. Kaisus was, according to Photius, an exile from his country, and was made phylarch of the Maadites by the Hamyarites. Procop. c. 20.

[5] Procopius, c. 19. Photius, p. 7.

[7] Procopius, de B. Pers. c. 20.

of Hirah. During his stay among the Arabians, Nonnosus had an opportunity of learning many of their peculiar customs and manners, and amongst other particulars, he left it on record that they had a sacred place, where, during certain months of the year they repaired in great numbers for religious worship, during which time was kept universal peace.[1] The Hamyarite port, from which he sailed to Adulis, was named Bulicas.[2] Between Adulis and Auxuma, which he described as a great city, was a journey of twelve days,[3] and in the intermediate region called Aueen, he saw not less than a thousand elephants.[4]

At Auxuma the embassy was received with every possible mark of friendship. The nadjash gave audience in the open field. He was seated on a lofty chariot, supported on four wheels, and drawn by as many elephants, caparisoned in plates of gold. From his middle a linen garment, interwoven with gold, descended below his thighs, and a loose tunic, covered with pearls and precious stones, hung from his shoulders. On his head he wore a linen cap, also covered with gold, from which descended four chains. His arms and neck were adorned with bracelets and chains of the same metal. He carried a small gilt shield and two spears in his hands, and was surrounded by his nobles in similar arms, and attended by a band of musicians. The ambassador

[1] Photius, ibid.
[2] Βουλικας, Procop. c. 19.
[3] Procopius, ib.
[4] Αυην. Photius, p. 7.

and his presents were received with respect, and when he had read the letters of the emperor urging him to make war on the Persians, and to send his merchants to the Roman ports, the Abyssinian prince brandished his weapons, and proclaimed incessant hostility against Kobad and the idolatrous Persians.[5]

The preparations of the Hamyarites and Abyssinians for the invasion of Persia were however never completed; for the reign and life of Aryat were shortened by civil discord. The spoils of Hamyar had, it is said, been divided among the Abyssinian chiefs to the entire exclusion of the soldiery, who, disappointed in their expectations of the reward due to their services, soon began to manifest their discontent. They were restrained only from actual rebellion, whilst they were engaged in seeking and punishing those participators and encouragers of the crimes of the preceding reign who had been marked out for their vengeance; but when peace had been restored in Arabia by their destruction, the general indignation could be no longer repressed. The standard of rebellion was set up, Aryat was deposed, and Abrahah proclaimed king of Yaman.[6] Abrahah was a Christian, and had been once the slave of a Roman merchant[7] of

[5] Jo. Malala, p. 194-6. Besides the authors already cited, this embassy is related, though briefly and very confusedly, by Theophanes, Chronograph. p. 206, 207.

[6] Nuweir, p. 84. Tabeir, p. 108. Mesoud, p. 142. Procopius de Bell. Pers. c. 20.

[7] Procopius, ib.

the city of Adulis, but had afterwards risen to rank in the Abyssinian army.[1] Aryat was assisted with fresh supplies from the king of Auxuma,[2] and the opposing armies were preparing to engage, when it was proposed to decide the quarrel by single combat. Abrahah was short and corpulent, his antagonist tall and strong. The latter aimed a spear at his head; but it only slightly wounded his forehead and nose, and the scar which remained procured for him afterwards the surname of Al Ashram, or the *split-nosed.* Abrahah had with him an attendant called Abûda, who, when he saw his master wounded, flew to his assistance and slew Aryat, and the whole army embraced the cause of his rival.[3]

After the death of Aryat the new king of Hamyar solicited a reconciliation with the nadjash. The latter, if we credit the Arabian histories, had vowed, in the first moments of his rage against the usurper, that he would not lay aside his arms till he had trampled under his feet the land of Abrahah, both mountain and vale, till he had stained his hand in his blood, and dragged him by the hair of the head. To appease the anger of the indignant monarch, Abrahah caused two sacks to be filled with earth collected from the mountains and vales of Hamyar, he suffered himself also to be bled, and filled a small bottle with his blood; to these he added some locks of hair which he had cut from his head. "O king,"

[1] Nuweir, p. 84.

[2] Procopius, ib.

[3] Tabeir, p. 110.

he said in his letter to the nadjash, "I and Aryat were both thy servants. He merited his death by his tyranny and injustice. Empty the earth out of the sacks and tread it beneath thy feet; it is the land of Hamyar; stain thy hands in my blood, which is contained in the bottle; and drag with thy hand the hair which I have myself cut from my forehead. Thus having fulfilled thy oath, turn away from me thine anger; for I am still one of thy servants, and am but an offending tributary amongst thy tributaries."[4] The nadjash was appeased, and Abrahah was confirmed in the kingdom of Hamyar, after having promised faithfully to continue for ever his tribute to the crown of Abyssinia.[5]

[4] Nuweir, p. 34. Tabeir, p. 110. Mesoud, p. 142.

[5] The outlines of the history of this event are given by Procopius, de Bel. Pers. c. 20. The details by the Arabian writers just cited.

SECTION VII.

THE reign of Abrahah was favourable to the extension of Christianity over the kingdom of Hamyar; and, whilst the Abyssinian power was preserved by his moderation and justice, the church flourished under the care of St. Gregentius, the pious bishop of Taphar. The vindictive measures which had been enforced against the enemies of the Christian faith were succeeded by a milder spirit. The unbelieving Jews were challenged to a public dispute with St. Gregentius; after an appointed period of forty days, they met in the royal hall in the city of Taphar,[1] in the presence of the king and his nobles; and Herban, a rabbi learned in the law and the prophets, was chosen to advocate the cause of Judaism. The dispute was continued with obstinacy during three successive days, till at length the Jews, vanquished but not convinced, were obliged to retreat from the place of contest; while the good bishop fell on his knees, and in presence of the king and his assembled subjects, offered thanks to heaven for his success. As he concluded, we are told, loud peals of thunder were heard from the east, the

1 Taphar, or Dhafar (Aphar in Diod. Sic.) became the second capital on the death of Hamyar, when the family of Kahlan ascended the throne.

heavens opened, and the figure of their Redeemer appeared in the clouds, approving his zeal. The Jews were suddenly struck with blindness, and received their sight only by the holy operation of Christian baptism. Herban, after becoming a Christian, gained the esteem of the king by his learning and merit, and was advanced to the highest honours in his kingdom.

The existence and history of St. Gregentius appear to be well authenticated by the Menæa and Martyrologies, but the particulars of his dispute with Herban, and its miraculous termination, were probably invented by some pious monks years after the time when they occurred.[2] Gregentius was long the friend and adviser of Abrahah, who is universally allowed to have been a zealous Christian, and a just king, charitable to those who were in necessity, and generous in advocating the cause of the unfortunate.[3]

[2] The tract which bears the title of "Gregentii Tephrensis episcopi disputatio cum Herbano Judæo," was edited in Greek and Latin by Gulerius (8vo. Lut. 1603), and an edition is given in the Magna Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum, vol. xi. Lambecius (Bibl. Cæs. lib. v. p. 277) imagines it to have been the work of Nonnosus, but with small show of probability. St. Gregentius is celebrated in the Menæa on the nineteenth day of December.

[3] Both Greek, Syrian, and Mohammedan agree in praising the character of Abrahah. The tract cited in the foregoing note calls Abrahah ὁ ευσεβεστατος βασιλευς. (S. Gregent. disput. p. 201.) Metaphrastes speaks of him as *virum pium et Christi nomine gloriantem.* Johan. As. Ep. observes that he was a zealous Christian (p. 43). In like manner he is described

With the assistance of his pious counsellor, he framed a code of laws for the government of Hamyar, which is still extant, and is divided into three-and-twenty titles.[1]

The last event of the reign of Abrahah was his disastrous expedition against the tribe of Koreish. The city of Mecca, which was in the possession of

by the Arabian writers as "a man small of body, fleshy, intelligent, and zealous in his Christianity"—وكان رجال قصيرا لحيما حارا في دين النصرانية Abu Gjafar Muhammed Ibn Jezyd, Taberita, p. 108. This historian has preserved an incident which will illustrate the character of the king, and the ideas of honour that were entertained among the Arabians of the time. In the conflict which placed Abrahah on the throne, his servant Abûda saved his life, and slew his enemy Aryat. The king in gratitude promised to grant him his desire, whatever it might be. Abûda demanded that no bride in Yaman should be conducted to her bridegroom until he had first enjoyed her. The king considered himself bound by the sanctity of his word, and the request was granted. Abûda was at length killed by an Arabian bridegroom whom he had insulted. "When the account of his death was carried to Abrahah, who was kind, generous, and pious in his Christianity, he said, I see, men of Yaman, that there are still some of you whose hearts are brave enough to disdain to suffer an indignity. I take God to witness, that had I known when I promised him his desire, what he intended to ask, I would never have promised it him, nor did I grant willingly his request; but I have no desire of revenging him, for by his death I am not displeased." p. 110, 112.

[1] A work bearing the title of *Νομοθεσιοι του ἁγιου Γρηγεντιου ὡς εκ προσωπου του ενσεβεστατου βασιλεως Αβραμιου*, is contained in a MS. of the dispute with Herban in the Bibl. Cæs. Lambecius, lib. v. p. 182-3.

this tribe, was the Eleusis of ancient Arabia. It is situated in a very narrow valley, between two ranges of lofty mountains, whose mean breadth does not much exceed nine hundred feet.[2] The Kaaba, or temple of Mecca, had been from time immemorial the most sacred resort of the Arabian idolaters. It had been several times enriched by the munificence of the tobbaas of Hamyar, and the power of the gods was said to have been more than once exerted in its defence. Around it were deposited the various idols of the different tribes. On the last month of the year a multitude of devotees assembled from all parts of Arabia. After having cast off their garments, they thrice made the circuit of the Kaaba, and kissed the sacred stone. When they had drunk of the holy well of Zemzem, they proceeded to the mountains, and seven times, in as many successive days, hurled stones against the evil genius in the valley of Mina. The ceremonies were finished by a sacrifice of sheep and camels.

The Christian king of Hamyar beheld with grief the multitudes of pilgrims who went to pay their superstitious devotions to the deities of the Kaaba, and resolved, by building a magnificent church at Sanaa, which appears to have been sometimes the capital of Yaman, to draw the curiosity and the worship of the Arabs to another object. The edifice was completed, and far surpassed in the splendour of its ornaments the object of their idolatrous reverence. But the

[2] Modern Traveller, Arabia, p. 254.

Arabs were not easily persuaded to desert the old object of their superstitions. A proclamation was therefore issued, that the pilgrims must relinquish their former route for the shorter and more convenient journey to the Christian church of Sanaa.[1] The Koreish, who found the number of votaries, and consequently the profits which they derived from them, decrease, did all in their power to cry it down.[2] Finding, however, that their endeavours had not so much effect as they expected, they had recourse to a more certain method of turning the respect of the Arabs from this new object of their devotion. The Arab tribes have been ever celebrated for their frequent ablutions, and for their peculiar abhorrence of any thing that is considered impure or polluted. One of the tribe of Kenanah, who was bribed by the guardians of the Kaaba, had been admitted to perform some of the duties appertaining to the church of Sanaa. Seizing an opportunity during the preparations for an extraordinary festival, he entered the church by night, and strewed it with dung; and then immediately fled from the town, spreading everywhere in his flight the news of the profanation of the Christian church.[3]

The profanation of the church of Sanaa was a signal of revolt to the idolatrous tribes of the north.

[1] Nuweir, p. 84. Tabeir, p. 112. D'Herbelot in *Abrahah.*

[2] D'Herbelot.

[3] Id. Some Arabian historians endeavour to throw the blame off the Koreish.

Many of the Arab chiefs were bound by the ties of friendship and gratitude to the service of Abrahah. To Muhammed Ibn Chozaa he had given the sceptre of the Modarites. Muhammed and his brother Kais proceeded to the land of Kenanah, to further the object of Abrahah, by compelling the devotees of the Kaaba to turn their steps to Sanaa; but the people of the Tehama rose against them, and Muhammed was slain with an arrow by Orwa Ibn Hiads Almalatsi. Kais fled to the court of Hamyar.[4]

The wrath of the king of Hamyar was doubly inflamed by the profanation of his church, and by the death of the king of Modar, and he vowed to take exemplary vengeance by the reduction of the tribe of Kenanah, and the entire demolition of the temple at Mecca.[5] At the head of an army, accompanied by numerous elephants, Abrahah marched towards Hedjaz, himself seated on one of these animals which was named Mahmoud, and was distinguished by its bulk and its skin of pure white.[6] The progress of the invader was opposed by Dzu Nepher, Ibn Habib, and other chiefs, at the head of the tribes of Hamedan and Chethamah, and their allies; but they were soon defeated, their leaders taken, and the army of Hamyar experienced little opposition, till it approached the neighbourhood of Mecca.

The chief of the tribe of Koreish, and the guardian

[4] Tabeir, p. 114.

[5] Nuweir, p. 86. Tabeir, p. 114. D'Herbelot.

[6] Nuweir, pp. 86 and 90. Tabeir, ib.

of the Kaaba, was at this time the venerable Abdolmotalleb Ibn Hasjemi, the grandfather of Muhammed. When the Koreish were informed of the approach of Abrahah, the reports of the numbers of his army and the terrible animals on which they were carried, struck them with consternation, and all hope of resistance vanished. In the negotiations which preceded his advance to the city, a third part of the wealth of Hedjaz was offered as a ransom for the Kaaba, but the king was still inflexible. Abdolmotalleb desired an audience of Abrahah, and was admitted to his presence, and treated with all the respect his age, his beauty, and his dignity deserved. Abrahah descended from his throne, and seated himself by his side. But the prince of Mecca came only to solicit the return of his camels, which had been taken among the plunder collected by the Christian soldiers. Abrahah expressed his surprise that the guardian of Mecca should think of his private property, amidst the evils that threatened his city. "The temple of Mecca, O king," answered Abdolmotalleb, "has its own lord, who will doubtlessly defend it, as he has defended it before. But I alone am the lord of my own camels." His camels were restored to him.[1]

On the nearer approach of Abrahah, the Koreish, and all the inhabitants of Mecca, led by Abdolmotalleb, unable to defend their city, took refuge on the neighbouring mountains, which overhung the narrow

[1] Nuweir, p. 88. Tabeir, p. 122.

pass through which the enemy must march. Abrahah now approached the city, and had entered the narrow valley which led to it, not knowing, apparently, that the Koreish occupied the heights; but the army of Hamyar, which had hitherto overcome all resistance, fell beneath the shower of masses of rock and other missiles, incessantly poured on them by their assailants. The combat was continued till evening, when Abrahah was obliged to make his retreat. The remains of his army were almost annihilated by the attacks of their victorious enemies, and the king returned a fugitive to Sanaa, where he died soon after of vexation as much as of his wounds.[2]

The Arabian writers, not less skilful in such compositions than the Christian monks, have invented a fable, to account for the miraculous defeat of the Hamyaritic army. The elephants of the Christians, they tell us, awestruck at the sight of the holy building, resisted every attempt to proceed, till towards evening, when an immense flock of birds of a kind which were called *ababeel*, rose like a cloud from the sea, and took their course towards the camp of Abrahah. These birds were about the size of a swallow, with green plumage and yellow beaks;

[2] The manner of Abrahah's defeat, as here told, is only a conjecture. Others have endeavoured to account for it by supposing his army to have been destroyed by the small-pox, or some epidemic disease. The situation, the traditional fables of the Arabs, which all say that the Christians were destroyed by stones that fell from the air, and the position of the Koreish, all favour the supposition which is here adopted.

each carried three pebbles, one in its beak, and one in each claw; and each of these stones had inscribed upon it the name of him whom it was to strike. They fell with such violence on the soldiers of Abrahah, as to pierce through their helmets and bodies, and even the animals on which they rode.[1]

[1] Besides the authorities already cited for the history of this expedition, may be consulted Gagnier, pref. in Abulfed. Hist. Moham. p. xx.

SECTION VIII.

THE news of the revolution in the affairs of Yaman, and the friendly professions of the new king, had been joyfully received at the court of Justinian, who hoped that he might at length rely on his assistance; but the promise of the king of Hamyar to take a part in the Persian war was never fulfilled. The ambassadors of Rome often urged Abrahah to the invasion of Persia, but the soldiers of Hamyar were disheartened by the prospect of a long and perilous march through the desert, to engage an enemy of such superior power and resources, and when Abrahah had once set out on the promised expedition, some domestic circumstance called him back almost as soon as he started.[2]

The last years of the reign of the Persian king Kobad were embittered by civil discord. This monarch had adopted the pernicious doctrines of Mazdak, who pretended to be a prophet sent from heaven to preach a community of women and possessions; the wives and estates of the Persian nobles were divided among the disciples of the impostor, and the mother of the great Noushirwan was only saved from prostitution by the urgent entreaties of her son. The king of Hirah, whose mother, from her beauty, had obtained the appellation of *Ma-es-*

[2] Procopius, lib. i. de Bel. Pers. c. 20.

55029

samai (celestial water), and who was known by the same name as his parent, had become obnoxious to Kobad for his opposition to the new doctrines, and he is said to have been deposed, and another king put in his place, who was willing to receive the doctrines approved by his master.[1] The defenceless state to which the dissensions between the Persian king and his nobles had reduced the empire, presented a favourable opportunity to the Arabs, and its provinces were laid waste by the continual incursions of the hordes of the desert.[2] Eastern writers give the following account of the hostile occupation of Hirah and of the death of Kobad.

The Persian monarch, having devoted himself to a life of abstinence and piety, shed not any blood, neither did he put any person to death, nor make war on any one, and Mazdak encouraged him in this line of conduct. Then all veneration and fear of Kobad departed from the hearts of the princes, and no one respected or dreaded him; and as they were free from any apprehensions of his attacking them, all the princes in his empire began to form ambitious projects. The king of the Arabs, Naaman ibn Al Mondar was under his subjection, and his residence was at Hirah; and there was a king in Syria called Hareth, the son of Amru, who was the son of Hogr of Kendah, who was tributary to the king of Yaman. Then Hareth came

[1] Rasmussen, pp. 11, 12. Pococke, Spec. p. 71.

[2] Asseman, Bibl. Orient. tom. i. p. 265.

from Syria to Kufa, and to Hirah, and slew Naaman, and seized upon his kingdom. Kobad sent a person to him, saying, "Why have you seized upon the kingdom without my commands? but as I hold you in esteem, a personal interview must take place between you and me, that I may prescribe to you the same conditions which were imposed on Naaman, and fix the boundaries of the land of the Arabs, and the limits of your kingdom, so that the Arabs shall not pass beyond them." Hareth came, and had an interview with Kobad, on the borders of the Suwad[3] of Irak, near Modaïene. Kobad assigned to Hareth the boundaries, saying—"The Arabian borders are from the desert to Kufa, and to the brink of the Euphrates; this side is the Suwad of Irak, and none of the Arabians must pass on this side from the brink of the Euphrates." Hareth acquiesced. But after this, Hareth, holding in contempt the words of Kobad, restrained not the Arabians; and they passed from their side of the Euphrates, and laid waste the villages of the Suwad. Kobad dispatched a messenger to Hareth, saying—"You have not observed the limits which I have assigned to you." Hareth replied—"Those plunderers are Arabs who prowl about night and day, it is impossible for me to watch them; for if I were to expend all that

[3] The name Suwad (سواد) is said to have been given to Irak from the black colour of the Arab tents with which it was covered when in their possession. Fundgruben des Orients, band. ii. p. 199. D'Herbelot in *Souad.*

I possess in endeavouring to restrain them, I should not have the power to accomplish it." Then Kobad gave to Hareth six large villages of those belonging to the Suwad on the banks of the Euphrates. When Hareth had taken possession of these, he restrained the Arabs from entering the Persian territories. The Arab king, having thus made trial of the weakness of Kobad, persuaded others of the more southernly tribes to join with him, invaded Persia, and proceeded as far as Rei, where the Persian monarch was slain.[1] The accession of Noushirwan was marked by the destruction of Mazdak and his adherents: Hareth was driven from Hirah, and compelled to take refuge amongst the tribes of the peninsula, and the king who had been deposed by Kobad was restored to his throne.[2]

The more immediate consequence of the Roman embassy to Hamyar and Auxuma was the renewal of the Persian war. No sooner had Noushirwan learnt that Belisarius had left the east to prosecute the war in Italy, than he began to seek causes of rupture with the Byzantine emperor. The Saracen prince was easily induced to invade the border pro-

[1] The foregoing is nearly a literal translation from the Tarikh Tabar, as given in Ouseley's Oriental Collections, vol. iii. p. 156, et seq. In the sequel the author confounds the incursion of the Arabs with the more ancient expeditions of the tobbaas of Yaman. Hamza relates, too, that the kingdom of Hirah was forcibly seized by Hareth. Rasmussen, pp. 11, 12.

[2] Rasmussen, p. 13.

vinces of the empire. A district which bordered on the territories of the mondar, as well as on those of Hareth, the king of the Roman Saracens, was claimed by the former; and his pretensions were disputed by Hareth, on the plea that its name, *Strata*, indicated it to have been a Roman possession. The proud spirit of the king of Hirah would not deign to dispute with words, and the territory of Ghassan was quickly overrun by his hostile bands.[3] Justinian expostulated with the Persian king against the hostilities of his tributary, but Noushirwan only reproached him with his endeavours to rouse against him the arms of Hamyar,[4] and with having, in a time of peace, attempted to seduce from his allegiance the king of Hirah. The hostilities of the mondar were continued, and the forces of Persia followed and supported him. Hareth had recourse to the same species of argument as his rival; at the instigation of Belisarius, who had been recalled to the defence of the east, he invaded Assyria, and collected an immense booty from the plunder of that rich province. Their Saracen allies, however, seem

[3] Procopius, de Bel. Pers. lib. ii. c. 1. I find mention of this *Strata*, or paved way, in the geography of Abulfeda, as cited by Schultens in his Index Geographicus to his edition of Bohaddin. Sarchadum is mentioned as a small town at the boundary of the Hauraun, in lon. 60° 20′, lat. 32° 15′. "A latere ejus Eoo viam pergis, quæ *Strata* appellatur, Irakam ferens. Narrant viatores, si teneatur, Sarchado Bagdadum perveniri decem præter propter diebus."

[4] Theophanes, ad an. 563.

always to have been regarded by the Byzantine court with suspicion, and Hareth is accused of having tried to deceive the Roman army, in order to secure his prey.[1] His faith was afterwards considered as proved by his inveterate hostility to the king of Hirah. In a war between the two Arab chiefs, which was carried on without the interference of either Persia or Rome, the son of Hareth fell into the power of the mondar, who sacrificed him to Venus, or Ozza, the deity worshipped by his tribe.[2] In a subsequent action the united forces of the mondar were defeated with great slaughter, and two of his sons made prisoners.

During the reigns of the mondar the son of Ma-es-samai, and of Amru ben Hind, flourished most of the celebrated poets, whose writings merited to be suspended in the Kaaba, and have thence received the name of *Moallakat,* or the suspended.[3] Despising the shackles of grammatical rules and prosody, which were not introduced till ages subsequent to Muhammed,[4] as much as they abhorred the

[1] Procopius, lib. ii. c. 1.

[2] Και απ' αυτου εγνωσθη ου καταπροϊεσθαι τα Ρωμαιων πραγματα Περσας Αρεθαν. Procopius, lib. ii. c. 28.

[3] Amru ben Keltum, ed. Kosegarten (4to. Jen. 1819.) p. 66. D'Herbelot in *Moallakat.* They have been translated by Sir W. Jones.

[4] Ante Muslemanismum Arabes, qui ad eloquentiam sua natura facti esse videntur, grammaticæ regulis non utebantur. Schamseldinæus Altensaræus, ap. Casiri, Biblioth. Hispan. Arab. tom. i. p. 1. The first who reduced the Arabian poetry to fixed and determinate laws of prosody and versification, was

chains of personal slavery, the greatest heroes amongst the Arabs were celebrated for the cultivation of eloquence and poetry.[5] The poems of the Arabs were of a peculiar character; commencing generally with the praise of his mistress, the poet proceeds to celebrate the bravery of his tribe, and almost always concludes by describing his personal exploits. Lebid was a hero of the tribe of Gafar,[6] which appears then to have been in alliance with that of Ghassan.[7] Whilst young, he accompanied the army of Hareth, king of Ghassan, against the son of Ma-es-samai, who was invading the Roman territory at the head of a powerful army. Lebid, with a hundred chosen companions, entered the camp of the enemy, penetrated to the tent of the king of Hirah, slew him, made good his retreat before the death of the king was known, and had a share in the battle which ensued, and which is celebrated by Arabian historians as the day of Holaimah.[8] Lebid is supposed to have composed his Moallakah in the reign of Amru ben Hind.[9]

The poet Amru'l-Kais was the son of Hogr, king of the Asadites, who was the son of that Hareth king of Kendah who had forcibly occupied the

Alchalil Ibn Ahmed Al Farahidi, who flourished under the khalifate of Haroun Al Raschid. Clerici Prosodia Arabica, p. 2.

[5] Kosegarten, Amru ben Keltum, p. 62.

[6] Peiper, Dissert. de Moallaka Lebidi (4to. 1823), p. 1.

[7] Peiper, ib. p. 8.

[8] Id. p. 2. Eichhorn, Mon. Antiq. p. 164.

[9] Magasin Encyclopédique, tom. i. p. 514.

kingdom of Hirah in the reign of Kobad.[1] The sons of Hareth were all celebrated chiefs: Sjerhabîl was king of Kelab, and Hogr had conquered the tribe of Asad, but his new subjects rebelled against him, and he fell a victim to their fury.[2] On hearing of the death of his father, Amru'l-Kais made a vow to abstain from the use of wine and oil till he had revenged it, and had killed with his own hand a hundred of the men of Asad. With the assistance of the Becrites and Taglabites, he fulfilled his vow, and regained the throne, but when he was left by his new allies, he was compelled to seek refuge from his subjects in Yemamah. The influence of the mondar of Hirah, who had been restored by Noushirwan, prevented the Arabian chiefs from giving assistance to the son of his enemy, and Amru'l-Kais, after many disappointments, fled to Ghassan, and sought assistance from the Roman emperor. Although, at first, he was well received by the court of Byzantium, he soon after fell a victim to its timid and treacherous policy, and was secretly poisoned.[3]

Various causes had long been combining to raise distrust between the Romans and their allies, but the breach was widened, and their connection finally destroyed by the bitterness of religious controversy.

[1] Hengstenberg, Amrulkeis Moallakah (4to. Bonn. 1823), prolegom. p. 5.

[2] The particulars of the history of Hogr, &c. have been before given in our third section.

[3] Hengstenberg, prolegom. p. 8. D'Herbelot in *Amrulkeis*. Poemation Ibn Doreid, ed. Haitsma (4to. Franeq. 1773), couplet 32, with the Arabian scholiast and notes, p. 189, &c.

SECTION IX.

THE disputes which agitated the eastern church on the subject of the incarnation, are celebrated for their unyielding acrimony.[4] The doctrine of two distinct persons in Christ was long supported by Nestorius with various fortunes; the orthodox believers triumphed in his death, but even his fall brought with it its own revenge, for the excess of zeal in his persecutors gave rise to a schism as obstinately persevered in, and far more pernicious in the result. The principles of the Monophysite doctrine, that of one nature, are said to have been supported by the writings of some of the early fathers.

The murder of the beautiful and accomplished Hypatia[5] has cast an eternal stain on the memory of Cyril of Alexandria. Cyril was at the head of that party most zealous against the doctrines of Nestorius; he had been denounced by the Nesto-

[4] Il n'y a jamais eu de schismes dans l'eglise plus pernicieux, et de plus longue durée, que ceux qu'a fait naître le dogme de l'Incarnation. La Croze, Histoire du Christianisme d'Ethiopie, p. 1.

[5] Προσελθουση γαρ κατα το ειωθος, επιθεμενοι πολλοι αθροοι, θηριωδεις ανθρωποι ὡς αληθως σχετλιοι, ουτε θεων οπιν ειδοτες, ουτ' ανθρωτων νεμεσιν, αναιρουσι την φιλοσοφον, αγος τουτο μεγιστον και ονειδος περιαψαμενοι τη πατριδι. Suidas in Ὑπατια. Her death is related by Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. lib. xi. c. 12.

rian party as a monster born and bred for the destruction of the church,[1] and in his controversial writings he laid the foundations for those dissensions by which the denunciation was at last fulfilled. Supported in some measure by passages in the works of St. Cyril, and trusting to the friendship and protection of the patriarch of Alexandria, Eutyches, a Byzantine archimandrite, or superior of three hundred monks, ventured to preach from the pulpit of the capital, in the year 488, the doctrine of one only undivided nature in Christ.[2] The heresy of Eutyches was new rather in name than in dogma. He is accused of asserting, in opposition to Nestorius, that Christ was never really man, but that his nature was one, the word, which was undivided and incarnate, bearing only whilst on earth a human shape.[3] The body of Christ was subtile, and entirely dissimilar to ours, and the Son of Mary participated in no degree of the human nature of his mother.[4] The doctrines

1 'Ο δε επ' ολεθρῳ των εκκλησιων τεχθεις και τραφεις. Concil. tom. iii. p. 1244 (Ed. Labb.) The Eutychians stigmatised the memory of Nestorius with names equally opprobrious; in the Syrian ritual called ܢܣܛܘܪ Nestorius is called ܚܠܝܠܐ *accursed.* Hottinger, Topographia Eccles. p. 138.

2 Mosheim, Hist. Eccl. cent. v. § 32.

3 Labb. Concil. tom. iv. p. 1079.

4 Takri-eddini Makrizii Hist. Copt. p. 57. Dioscorus, the Alexandrian primate, and the friend of Eutyches, expressed the Monophysite doctrine thus: "Messiam esse substantiam unam ex substantiis duabus, personam unam ex personis duabus, naturam unam ex naturis duabus, et voluntatem unam ex

of Eutyches were warmly opposed by Flavian, the primate of Constantinople; and, attended by some of his friends, their author was tried before an assembly of thirty bishops. To the question of Flavian, "Dost thou acknowledge that Jesus Christ, the only Son of God, resembles the Father in his godhead, and his mother in his humanity—that he consists of two natures?" he answered—"As I acknowledge him for my God, and for the Lord of heaven and earth, I presume not to define his nature; but that he possesses a human nature like ours, I have not yet acknowledged." "But," said Flavian, "dost thou not believe that he may be like God in his divinity, and like us men in his humanity?" "Hitherto I have never said that the body of the Lord our God is like ours; but I acknowledge that the holy virgin was of the same nature as we, and that our God received

voluntatibus duabus." Id. p. 59. The creed of the Jacobites as given by Ibn Batrik (Hotting. Topogr. Christiana Orient. p. 16), was طبيعة واحدة ومشية واحدة وفعل واحد "one nature and one will and one operation." In the Comment. de Ordinat. (Hotting. p. 18), it is expressed thus—"From the womb he had unity personally and naturally, and from that time God was incarnate. And there was one nature in him, as also one person, but not two natures, or in two natures"—ܡܢ ܟܝܢܐ ܐܚܕ ܘܐܝܟ ܦܓܪܐ ܟܕ ܐܠܗܐ ܥܡ ܟܝܢܐ ܐܚܕ The author of the Syriac work on the Jacobite doctrines cited by Hottinger (p. 27), when speaking of the incarnation uses such phrases as ܠܒܫ ܦܓܪܐ he put on the body, or he appeared ܐܬܚܙܐ ܕܒܪ ܐܢܫ in the form of a man, or ܐܬܕܡܝ ܠܢ he became like us, or ܩܒܠ ܨܠܡܢ he bore our image.

his flesh from her." The patrician Florentius demanded, "Dost thou acknowledge, that after his incarnation he consists of two natures?" "I acknowledge," replied Eutyches, "that he consisted of two natures before their union, but after that I allow but one." Eutyches, in defence of his opinions, urged the authority of the writings of Athanasius and Cyril, but before the meeting was dissolved, Flavian, in the name of the whole assembly, declared that he was convicted by his own confessions of the errors of Valentinus and Apollinaris, and that he was no longer to be considered a member of the church of Christ.[1]

Eutyches, however, was not disposed to yield quietly to the decrees of the meeting by which he had been condemned. Chrysaphius, the favourite minister of the emperor, was his godson and his friend; his cause was advocated by Dioscorus, the patriarch of Alexandria, and at the instigation of the former, Theodosius was induced to call a general council, to whose judgment he agreed to submit. Accordingly, on the 8th of August in the year 449, one hundred and thirty bishops, with a numerous train of monks, assembled at Ephesus. Three deputies, one of whom was Julius, bishop of Puteoli, were sent from Rome by Leo, who had already declared his hostility to the Monophysite doctrines. But the party of Eutyches was strongest in the weapons of the spirit and of the flesh. Dioscorus brought with him a numerous

[1] Concil. tom. iv.

train of followers who were ready to support him with words or blows; Barsumas, who attended as the chief and representative of the Syrian monks, was one of his friends, and even the officers who had been deputed by the emperor to preserve tranquillity during the debate, Elpidius and Eulogius, with the proconsul of Asia, favoured his cause. After the council had been opened with the due ceremonies, Eutyches arose, and spoke in defence of his doctrines. His accuser, Eusebius of Dorylæum, was only allowed to read the transactions of the council of Constantinople; when he came to that part in which Eutyches was required to acknowledge two natures in Christ as to his incarnation, the clamours of the assembly would allow him to proceed no farther. "Eusebius," they said, "ought to be burnt alive, to be cut in two; as he seeks division let him be divided."[2] The threatening looks of Dioscorus and his attendants, and the formidable train of monks and soldiers, prevailed, and it was declared as the sentence of the assembled bishops, that the dogmata of Eutyches were free from error, that Dioscorus held the same faith as his predecessor Cyril, and that Eutyches himself should be again received into the communion of the Church. The anathemas which had been hurled against Eutyches at Constantinople, were retorted on Flavian and Eusebius, and those who professed the doctrine of

[2] Καυσον Ευσεβιον, ουτος ζων καη, ουτος εις δυο γενηται, ως εμερισε μερισθη.

the two natures, and the united voice of the assembly was raised in the wish that those who divided Christ into two might be accursed, that they might be outlawed, that they might be hewn in pieces with the sword. Many of the eastern bishops of the diocese of Byzantium attempted to expostulate with Dioscorus in defence of Flavian. "What!" said he, "will you raise a tumult? Where are the officers?" Elpidius and Eulogius, with the military, followed by a crowd of monks, immediately entered the church, and the terrified bishops successively subscribed the condemnation of the primate of Byzantium. Flavian, with the Roman deputies, still protesting against his sentence, the dispute was carried from words to blows, he was thrown down, kicked, and trampled upon by Dioscorus and Barsumas, and is said to have died of his bruises before he reached Epipa in Lydia, the place appointed for his exile.[1]

Leo, the Roman pontiff, was the chief enemy of Dioscorus and the Eutychians, and had signified his entire approval of the proceedings of Flavian at

1 Concil. tom. iv. p. 1423. See Liberatus, c. 12.; Leo Magn. Epist. 93.; Nicephorus, Hist. Eccl. lib. xiv. c. 47.; Evagrius, lib. ii. c. 2.; Zonaras, lib. xiii. p. 43. tom. ii. The bishops deposed at Ephesus by Dioscorus were, Flavian of Constantinople, Domnus of Antioch, Irenæus of Tyre, Ibas of Edessa, Eusebius of Dorilæum, Daniel of Haran, Sophronius of Tela, and Theodorus of Cyrus. Chronicon Edessen. ap. Asseman. tom. i. p. 202.

Constantinople.[2] During the remainder of the reign of Theodosius, in spite of the repeated and earnest solicitations of the Roman pontiff, the decrees of the council of Ephesus were received by the eastern church, but his successor Marcian, and the new empress Pulcheria, were firm friends of Leo and of the religious party which he supported. A new general council of the bishops was summoned, and they assembled in the year 451, in the church of St. Euphemia at Chalcedon, a town in the neighbourhood of Constantinople, the site of which is now occupied by the modern Turkish village of Kadi-keui. The absolute power of the monarch governed the proceedings; the primate of Egypt was obliged to appear before the synod as a criminal, and the reiterated cries of the bishops of Asia, Thrace, and Pontus were, "Out with the murderer Dioscorus; who does not know the deeds of Dioscorus?"[3] Dioscorus pleaded that his proceedings had been authorised by the eastern bishops—they excused themselves under the plea of having been forced to compliance[4]—he, on the other hand, accused them of

[2] Δικαιοτατα γενοιτο αν εξω της του Θεου εκκλησιας, ὁς τις εν τῳ Χριστῳ την ανθρωπινην, τουτ᾽στι την ἡμετεραν, αρνειται φυσιν. Epist. Leonis ad Archimandritas Constant.—The letters between Leo, Flavian, Pulcheria, &c. on the Eutychian heresy, may be consulted in Cotelier, Eccl. Gr. Monument. tom. i. p. 50, et seq.

[3] Διοσκορον τον φονεα εξω βαλε· Διοσκορου τας πραξεις τις ουκ οιδεν;

[4] Στρατιῶται μετα βακλων και ξιφων επεστησαν· και τα βακλα και

having joined in the clamours against Eusebius, and in the reproaches that were uttered—"We did not say it," answered the Orientals, "the Egyptians said it; Dioscorus said it." The bishops of Egypt stepped forward boldly and exclaimed aloud, "We said this then, and we say it now." Dioscorus was deposed and banished, and ended his life at Gangra in Paphlagonia.[1]

The decrees of the council of Chalcedon were but the introduction to greater disorders. The monks of Egypt, as well as those of Syria and Arabia, were noted for their great piety, and for the excess and obstinacy of their zeal.[2] Their long and painful noviciate in the solitary deserts, inured them in the

τα ξιφη εφοβηθημεν. οπου ξιφη και βακλα, ποια συνοδος; στρατιωτας δια τουτου ελαβε Διοσκορος. τον φονεα εξω βαλε. Φλαυιανον στρατιωται καθειλον.

[1] See the Concilia, and authorities cited before. Dioscorus was stigmatised by the name of Pharaoh—ταυτα του Φαραω εισιν. Among the bishops of Arabia and Syria who were at Chalcedon occur the names of Juvenal of Jerusalem and Constantine of Bostra, which was the ecclesiastical metropolis of Arabia, as well as the bishops of Damascus, Hierapolis, Edessa, Amida, Melitena, Berrhæa, Gabala, Paltus, Seleucobelus, Adrana, Philadelphia, Philippopolis, Orthosias, Heliopolis Libani, Emessa, Carræ, Saracenorum gentis, Chrysopolis Arabiæ, &c.

[2] Etiam e sacris historiis lingua Copta scriptis, apparet, innocentissimæ vitæ homines fuisse Coptitas, usque adeo ferventes Christianæ vitæ cultores, ut nullis unquam suppliciorum generibus a suscepta semel fide vitaque abduci potuerint. Kircher, prodrom. in Ling. Copt.

virtues of patience and perseverance,[3] and in their pride and independence of spirit, as in their hospitality,[4] they resembled the untamed Arab of the wil-

[3] The following anecdote, from a tract entitled Apophthegmata Sanct. Anachoritarum Ægypti, published in the Bibliotheca Magn. Patrum, tom. ix. (p. 730), may serve to illustrate their mode of life. Frater quidem sedens singularis turbabatur: et pergens ad abbatem Theodorum de Firme, dixit ei, quia conturbaretur. Senex autem dixit ei: vade, humilia mentem tuam, et subdete, habita cum aliis. Et reversus postea ad senem, dixit ei: Nec cum aliis hominibus habitans, quietem invenio. Et dixit ei senex: Si solitarius non quiescis, neque cum aliis, cur voluisti monachum facere? Nonne ut sustineas tribulationes? Dic autem mihi quot annos habes in habitu isto. Et dixit ei, octo. Et dicit ei senex: Crede mihi, habeo in habitu isto septuaginta annos, et nec una die potui requiem invenire, et tu in octo annos requiem vis habere. The following is from the same work (p. 729)—Sanctus Antonius abbas cum sederet aliquando in eremo, animus ejus tædium et confusionem cogitationum incurrit, et dicebat ad Deum: Domine, volo salvus fieri, et non me permittunt cogitationes meæ. Quid faciam in hac tribulatione, quomodo salvus ero? Et modice assurgens, cœpit foras exire, et vidit quendam, tanquam seipsum, sedentem atque operantem, deinde surgentem ab operibus et orantem, et iterum sedentem, et flectam de palmis facientem, et inde rursus ad orationem surgentem. Erat autem angelus Domini missus ad correptionem et cautelam dandam Antoniæ. Et audivit vocem angeli dicentis: Sic fac, et salvus eris. Ille autem, hoc audito, magnum gaudium sumpsit atque fiduciam. Et ita faciens, salutem quam quærebat invenit.

[4] Anecdotes of their hospitality are given in the work cited in the preceding note, lib. xiii. p. 767, &c. When benighted in the desert, even a Manichean, the most hateful of heretics, found shelter amongst the monks of Nitria.—Καλη εστιν ἡ φιλοξενια, says the bishop Antiochus, και τῳ Θεῳ αρεσκουσα,

derness. The bishops and monks of Egypt and Arabia were therefore little inclined to yield to the anathemas of Leo, or to the authority of the emperor. The controversialists of the ancient church were not over scrupulous in the choice of their weapons, and books were frequently forged to support their arguments.[1] Thus the works attributed to Dionysius the Areopagite, are believed to have been forged by Synesius, bishop of Ptolemais, at the instigation of Cyril of Alexandria,[2] and Cyril himself made use of books falsely ascribed to Athanasius. Synesius, in a letter to one of his friends, openly advocated the practice of falsehood, and asserted that truth is dangerous to the multitude whose weak minds are not fitted for its reception. All these expedients were adopted with increase of acrimony. The Eutychians only acknowledged the acts of the synod of Ephesus, while the emperor wished to force on them the decrees of that of Chalcedon. The former was characterized by those who had subscribed to the faith of Leo, as a band of robbers;[3] the Monophysites denounced the latter as an impious assemblage of demons, of spirits shut out from the mercy of heaven.[4]

μαλιστα δε προς τους οικειους της πιστεως. Antiochi Ep. Homil. cxvii. p. 169. Bibl. Patr. tom. xii.

[1] See La Croze, Christianisme d'Ethiopie, pp. 23, &c.

[2] La Croze, p. 10.

[3] Συνοδον ληστρικον.

[4] Jacobus, bishop of Sarug, has left us a Syrian tract "against the impious synod of Chalcedon," in which he says ܗܕܐ ܗܘ ܣܘܢܗܕܘܣ ܕܟܠܩܕܘܢ ܕܫܪܝܪ ܗܘ ܟܢܫܬܐ ܕܫܝܛܢ ܘܓܕܕܐ ܕܡܢ ܪܚܡܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܐܬܪܚܩ ܗܘ ܟܢܫܬܐ ܕܫܝܛܢ ܘܓܕܕܐ ܕܡܢ ܪܚܡܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܐܬܪܚܩ ; —"This is that synod of Chalcedon which dæmons

The Syrian monks were ever ready to use the weapons of the flesh; the holy city of Jerusalem was occupied by a tumultuous mob, and the Monophysite doctrines were spread by Barsumas in Armenia and Mesopotamia. Such of the Egyptian bishops as were favourable to the synod of Chalcedon were obliged to be held in their sees by force. Proterius, who was placed by the emperor in the chair of Dioscorus, was safe only in the protection of his numerous guard; on the emperor's death he was massacred by the people of Alexandria, and Timothy Ælurus, or the Cat, his murderer, substituted in his place.[5] After years of tumult and disorder, when the bitterness of religious warfare was mitigated by the Henoticum of Zeno, Petrus Moggus, the patriarch of Alexandria, and Petrus Gnapheus, the patriarch of Antioch, were at the head of the Monophysite sect.[6]

and spirits cast down from heaven have assembled." Asseman. Bibl. Orient. tom. i. p. 295.

[5] Theodorus Lector. Renaudot. Victor, Chron. pp. 322, 4.

[6] Evagrius, lib. 2, 3; Liberatus, cc. 14—19; may be consulted for a general history of the troubles in Egypt. The Henoticum was violently opposed by the Romans. Zenon imperator, Eutychiani poculo erroris sopitus, Acatium Constantinopolit. episcopum damnatoribus synodi Chalcedonensis Petro Alexandrino et Petro Antiocheno episcopis, per Henoticum a se prolatum socians, eorum communione polluitur, et cum eis a Catholica fide recedit.—Victor, Chron. p. 324. The three primates of the east, Peter of Alexandria, Peter of Antioch, and Acatius of Constantinople, were included in the anathemas of Leo. Ib. pp. 324, 5.

In the reigns of Zeno and Anastasius, the Monophysites had themselves separated into several sects and parties. Anastasius is accused of being himself a Jacobite,[1] and of being instigated by Xenaias of Mabug or Hierapolis, to the persecution of those bishops who were most zealous for the doctrines of the synod of Chalcedon. Euthemius and his successor Macedonius were banished from the see of Constantinople for their opinions. A similar charge was formed against Flavian, bishop of Antioch, and a number of Syrian monks were assembled there to demand his abjuration of the doctrine of the two natures. But the zeal of the people of Antioch in defence of their pastor, afforded a more convenient pretence for his persecution; they rose against the Syrian monks, many of whom were slain or drowned in the Orontes whilst endeavouring to make their escape, and Flavian was accused of sedition, and banished to Petra. Severus, a zealous Monophysite, was called from his monastery at Gaza, raised to the chair of Flavian, ascended the pulpit of Antioch, and pronounced a general anathema against those who acknowledged two natures in Christ.[2]

[1] Eutychius, tom. ii. p. 131. Leontius (de Sectis, p. 512. in the Bibl. Magn. Pat. tom. xi.) says, *των γαρ διακρινομενων ην ὁ Αναστασιος*. The name of doubters or hesitaters (*οἱ διακρινομενοι*) was given by the Melchites to those who received the Henoticum. Timotheus de recept. Hæret., in Cotelier, tom. ii. A synod at Tyre anathematized the Henoticum. Asseman. tom. ii. p. 19.

[2] The elevation of Severus took place in 512. His history is

Severus thus became the head of the Syrian Monophysites. His character is drawn by his enemies, probably not without reason, in the blackest colours. He had been originally a pagan, and he appears to have been a restless and ambitious man, proud, cunning, and malignant, but learned, and a subtle controversialist. He commenced his episcopal career with the most violent measures against those bishops and priests in his diocese who were favourers of the council of Chalcedon. Those who had ventured to oppose him, such as Epiphanius bishop of Tyre, Julian of Bostra, and Peter of Damascus, were obliged to take refuge from his resentment in Palestine and other parts that were beyond the reach of his jurisdiction. Elias bishop of Jerusalem was celebrated for his firmness in the orthodox creed. He called together the bishops of his party and anathematized Anastasius and Severus, and all who followed their opinions, thus drawing upon himself the full resentment of the emperor. Sabas, in company with others of the monks of Palestine, repaired to Constantinople, to expostulate, and he was treated with great respect by Anastasius, "who," to use the words of the old historian, "although he had been led astray by wicked advisers, was still a great lover of

collected from Evagrius, Hist. Eccl. lib. iii. Eutychius, p. 141. tom. ii. Renaudot, Hist. Patriarch. Alexand. p. 129. Cyril. in Vit. S. Sabæ, p. 308. (Cotelier, tom. ii.) Severus was a native of Sozopolis.

the monks;"[1] but Elias was deposed, and his see given to the Eutychian John.[2]

It was not without reason that the Monophysites accused the emperors of introducing the creed of Leo, and the doctrine of two substances, two natures, and two wills, in one person, with all the troubles and dissensions entailed upon it, into the eastern church.[3] The authority of Marcian had first procured the deposition of Dioscorus, and the condemnation of Eutyches, and he and his successors afterwards were the cause of the persecution of their followers. The Monophysites, accordingly, who considered themselves as holding the orthodox faith, that faith which had condemned the heresy of Nestorius, denounced the emperors as innovators and heretics, and stigmatized those, whom fear had induced to accept their form of faith, by the name of Melchites or royalists.[4] Justinian was characterized as the most orthodox, and at the same time the most illiterate of the emperors.[5] Whilst he was defining and dictating a form of faith to his subjects, the offices and dignities of the empire were sold to un-

[1] Ην γαρ φιλομοναχος, ει και ὑπὸ τινων μιαρων παρεσκευαζετο την ορθην εκπολεμησαι πιστιν. Cyril, vit. S. Sabæ, p. 299.

[2] Eutychius, tom. ii. pp. 141, 2. Victor, Chron. pp. 337. Cyril. vita S. Sabæ, (in Cotelier, tom. ii.) pp. 295—308.

[3] Makrizi, Hist. Copt. p. 59.

[4] Niceph. Callist. Hist. Eccl. lib. xviii. c. 52.

[5] Ορθοδοξοτατος. ην δε αμαθητος γραμματων, και το δε λεγομενον αναλφαβητος. Suidas in Ιουστινιανος.

worthy bidders, whose only anxiety was to gratify their own and the emperor's insatiate avarice.[6] The reign of Justinian was a continued scene of persecution, but, while the decrees of the council of Chalcedon were by him forced on the eastern bishops, the cause of the Eutychians found a powerful advocate in the person of the empress. Theodora had been educated in the faith of the Monophysites, and whilst her husband was assisting the partisans of the Melchite sect with his authority, she supported the opposite party with her money and her influence.[7]

The accession of Justin, who held the orthodox creed of Chalcedon, had been the signal for new disturbances and persecutions. The bishops who had been banished during the late reign were recalled, Severus fled to Egypt,[8] the see of Antioch

[6] Ὡς πρωτοις τοις αλλοις κακοις, και ες τας πολιτικας αρχας κα θιστηανδρας απηνεις, και ωμοτατους, ὡν ην Στεφανος ὁ Εννουχος Περσης ταμιας των βασιλικων χρηματων. Id. ib. Compare what the same writer says in v. Θεοδοτος, and Evagrius, lib. iv. c. 30.

[7] Αλλ' ὁ μεν των εν Καλχηδονι συντεθειμενων μαλα σπουδαιως αντελαμβανετο, ἡ δε, μετα των απεναντιας ουσα, των λεγοντων μιαν φυσιν παντοιως προὐνοει, και τους γε ἡμεδαπους περιεθαπτε, και τρυς αλλοδαπους μεγαλοις χρημασιν εδεξιουτο. Evagrius, lib. iv. c. 10. See Barhebræi Chron. Syr. p. 83.

[8] Renaudot, p. 138. Eutychius, p. 149. tom. ii. Victor, Chron. p. 329, &c. A synod was held at Constantinople, κατα δυσσεβους Σευηρου και των τα ομοια αυτῳ φρονησαντων αἱρετικων. Montfaucon, Bibliotheca Coisliniana, p. 86. In a MS. containing, Οροι πιστεως ορθοδοξιας ἁγιων πατερων κατα Ευτυχους του ατυχους και Διοσκορου του ασεβους (p. 265), he is termed, Σευηρον τον ασεβη και Ελληνοφρονον (p. 266). Many of his

was given to Sergius, and his friend Xenaias died a fugitive in Paphlagonia.[1] Fifty-four Monophysite bishops were participators with them in exile,[2] and the prisons of Constantinople were filled with the ecclesiastics of the eastern Church. Under the protection of their empress, however, and by the labours of Jacobus Baradæus, from whom the sect afterwards took the name of Jacobites, the doctrine of the one nature was spread over the eastern and southern provinces of the Byzantine empire.

letters are preserved in the same collection. (pp. 44, 55, 68, &c.) A poem of George of Pisidia against Severus is published amongst his works, p. 171.

[1] Xenaias or Philoxenus, bishop of Mabug, was celebrated for his wisdom and learning. Asseman. tom. ii. p. 10. Yet he was accused by his enemies of being inclined to Manicheism. (p. 19.) But we need not wonder at this, for we know that the Melchites censured Eutychianism itself as Manicheism and worse—Μανιχαιος οὑτος ὁ λογος και πεφαντασμενος πολλῳ μαλλον εκεινου. Suidas in Ευτυχης. Philoxenus was ordained bishop of Hieropolis by Petrus Gnapheus. Theophanes, Chronograph. p. 115.

[2] Amongst the Monophysite bishops under Severus we find mention of those of Apamea, Laodicea, Aleppo or Berrhæa, Seleucia, Kennesrin, Amida, Damascus, Abila, Jabrudi, Tadmor or Palmyra, Hurini, Cyrus, Germanicia, Edessa, Haran, Ammiria, Perrhi, Rhesænæ, Circesium, Callinicus, Sura, Tela, Dara, Arsamosata, Anazarba, Hegari, Mopsuestia, Epiphania, Irenopolis, Alexandria Minor, Colonia, Therma, Sebaste, &c. who were banished by Justinian. Assem. tom. ii. Diss. de Monophys.

SECTION X.

JACOBUS Baradæus, or Zanzalus, was a Syrian monk, had been educated in the doctrines of Severus,[3] and they both rose to fame under the favour of Anastasius.[4] After the death of that emperor he was created bishop of Edessa by the Monophysite bishops who were confined at Constantinople,[5] and his unceasing labours in their cause made him worthy to be looked on as the head of the Monophysite sect.[6] By Baradæus and his partisans, who were spread over every part of the Syrian frontiers, and by the numerous bishops and presbyters whom he created there,[7] the Monophysite faith appears to have been first firmly established among the Arab tribes.[8] Hareth, the king of the western

[3] Renaudot, Hist. Patr. Al. p. 133.

[4] Asseman, Bibl. Orient. tom. iii. p. 384.

[5] Barhebræus, in Asseman. tom. ii. p. 327.

[6] In an Arabic MS. cited by Asseman. tom. ii. p. 64, Baradæus is termed primate of the Jacobites, Syrians, Copts, and Æthiopians—مار يعقوب البرادعي راس اساقفة اليعاقبة السريان والقبط والحبش

[7] He made above a hundred thousand bishops, priests, and deacons, if we believe Barhebræus. Assem. tom. ii. p. 332.

[8] Barhebræus, Hist. Dynast. p. 93.

Arabs, and his son after him, ardently supported their cause amongst the tribes of Ghassan, and received under his protection Paul the patriarch of Antioch, and other bishops who fled from the persecution of Justinian;[1] a Christian king of Hirah resolutely withstood the pressing importunities of the Chalcedonian bishops;[2] and the Jacobite faith was established at the two widely separated towns of Nadjran and Hormus, and amongst all the Scenite tribes.[3] The designs of Baradæus were seconded by the chiefs of the desert, and he was carried from place to place on the swiftest dromedaries of an Arab king.[4] By his zeal the anti-Chalcedonian doctrines were supported also in the southern peninsula, and amongst the distant Christians of Ethiopia.

The Abyssinian Christians have always acknowledged as their head the primate of Alexandria.[5] They seem to have received at an early period the

[1] Asseman. tom. ii. p. 326, 331. tom. iii. p. DCVI. Paul was made patriarch of Antioch by Baradæus. Tom. ii. p. 63.

[2] Theodorus Lector, Excerpt. p. 564.

[3] Asseman. tom. ii. p. DCV.

[4] It was الملك الحرث البدوي king Hareth the Beduite, according to Amrus, ap. Assem. tom. ii. p. 63.

[5] Abudacnus, Hist. Copt. c. 2. p. 3. The Abyssinians were under the same rule and discipline as the Copts. Rogatus Tecla Maria, Abyssinus presbyter, an a Coptis Abyssinis discreparent, respondet, nullam esse differentiam inter eos et in omnibus rebus concordare. Esse etiam sub ejusdem patriarchæ imperio. Hottinger, Hist. Eccl. Sec. 16. part i. p. 44.

heresy of Eutyches, and steadily refused to acknowledge the councils that were held against it.[6] On the death of the chief of the Ethiopian bishops, another had been immediately appointed in his place by the Melchites, or those who professed the same faith as the emperor; but by the united interest of Theodora, of the Coptic Jacobites of Egypt, and of Baradæus, the bishop who had been appointed by the Chalcedonians was detained at the court of one of the independent chiefs,[7] through whose dominions

[6] In the modern Ethiopian liturgy, they offer up their prayers in the name of Christ, of the virgin, of the apostles, of the saints, et patrum nostrorum principum episcoporum trecentorum decem et octo qui fuerunt Niceæ, et centum quinquaginta qui fuerunt Constantinopoli, et ducentorum qui fuerunt Ephesi. (Missa Æthiopum, in Bibl. Magn. Patrum. Par. 1654, tom. vi. col. 54.); thus acknowledging the synod at Ephesus, and discarding that of Chalcedon and those which followed. Again at p. 45: Et per os trecentorum et decem et octo episcoporum qui pro recta fide in synodo Nicena congregati fuerunt, et centum quinquaginta in Constantinopolitana, et ducentorum in synodo Ephesina, et per os pontificis nostri Saviros, Joannis Chrysostomi oris aurei, Cyrilli, Basilii, Theophili, Athanasii, Gregorii, &c.

[7] Barhebræus calls him governor of the Thebaid. The Arabian writer de fide Syr. Jacobitarum says he was king of the *Suachini*. Philostratus says that Apollonius came to a district on the borders between Egypt and Ethiopia, which was called Sycaminum, which may be the same. επι τα Αιθιοπων τε και Αιγυπτιων ορια, Συκαμινον δε αυτα ονομαζουσι. Vit. Apol. Tyan. lib. vi. c. 2. On which Olearius observes, Ἱεραν Συκαμινον post Thebarum νομον et Elethyiam in Ægypto memorat Ptolemæus.

he had to pass, whilst another bishop, probably created by Baradæus, hastened to Abyssinia, was received by the Auxumites, and the Melchite bishop, when he arrived, found his see already occupied, and the Christians of Ethiopia not inclined to change their opinions in his favour.[1]

The bishops whom Baradæus had created were in the mean time carrying his doctrines towards the east and north. Achumedes, one of the most celebrated, converted many of the Persian Magi at Tacrit.[2] Baradæus is recorded to have traversed in person the regions of Armenia and Mesopotamia, and in a general massacre of the Christians of Tacrit, by orders of Khosroës Parvis, he escaped only by assuming the costume of a Persian sage.[3] His death in 578, after having been bishop of Edessa seven and thirty years,[4] was no less a subject of exultation to his enemies than the miserable end of the empress Theodora.[5] Whilst Baradæus was

[1] MS. de Fide Jac. Syr. ap. Asseman. p. 384. tom. i.—Barhebræus, ap. eundem, tom. ii. p. 330.

[2] Barhebræus, ap. Assem. tom. ii. p. 414. Ibn Batric, ap. Hotting. Topog. Eccles. p. 20.

[3] MS. Arab. ap. Assem. tom. ii. p. 63. Amrus, ap. eund. tom. iii. p. 384. The history is adopted by Renaudot, but discarded by Asseman.

[4] Asseman. tom. ii. p. 65. The name of Jacobus occurs in a Greek writer among the Eutychian heretics, in Cotelier, tom. ii. p. 396.

[5] The Melchites boasted that—Theodora Augusta, Chalcedonensis synodi inimica, canceris plaga corpore toto perfusa, vitam prodigiose finivit. Victor, Chron. p. 332. ed. Canisii.

supporting by his zeal the Monophysites of Nubia and Ethiopia, the persecution of the Jacobite bishops in the less remote districts was raging with redoubled vigour. Eight hundred bishops and archbishops, who had refused to conform to the synod of Chalcedon, filled the imperial prisons,[6] and Maras of Amida, Isidore of Causarum, and other Syrian prelates, were only recalled from Petra, their place of exile, at the earnest intercessions of Theodora.[7]

The unsubmitting and irritable character and predatory habits of the Saracen Arabs, always made them suspected and distrusted by the Romans, and, to use the words of the historian, neither to be desired as friends or enemies.[8] It is one of their own proverbs, that "There is no authority where there is no obedience," the truth of which was experienced equally by the court of Byzantium and the house of the Khosroës. Although Noman ibn Mondar, the king of Hirah, governed the Arabs only as the lieutenant and tributary of Noushirwan, and although the distance between Hirah and Modaïne, the capital of Persia, was but a few farsangs, yet he was continually in open rebellion against his master; when

[6] MS. Arab. de Laud. Jacobit. ap. Asseman. tom. ii. pp. 63, 4.

[7] Joan. As. Episc. ap. Assem. tom. ii. p. 51.

[8] Saraceni tamen nec amici nobis unquam nec hostes optandi, ultro citroque discursantes, quidquid inveniri poterat momento temporis parvi vastabant, milvorum rapacium similes; qui si prædam dispexerint celsius, volatu rapiunt celeri, aut nisi impetraverint, non immorantur. Ammianus Marcellinus, lib. xiv. c. 4.

he appeared at the imperial court he assumed an offensive degree of familiarity and boldness, and when the Khosroës attempted to force him to obedience, he always found a secure shelter in the solitude of the desert.[1] The Romans had frequent causes of complaint against their Saracen allies. During the reign of Anastasius they more than once invaded the districts of Euphratesia, Palestine, and Syria, but were defeated by the promptitude of the governors of the provinces;[2] and Amru'l-Keis ben Naukal had obtained by force several districts to the south of Palestine, and the island of Iotabe, and had been confirmed in his conquest and made a governor of the Arab tribes by the emperor, on his submission.[3]

With a people of this character, it may be supposed that the violent measures of Justinian against the Monophysites would be the least likely to produce submission. Hareth, the king of the

[1] Fakhr-eddin Razi, Hist. Chron. Dynast. ap. De Sacy, Chrestomathie Arab., tom. i. p. 62.

[2] Theophanes, Chronograph. pp. 121—123.

[3] This occurrence is placed by Theophanes (p. 121) in the reign of Anastasius. The historian Malchus (Eclogæ Legat. ed. Hoeschelio, p. 73), has given a particular relation of it, and says it was under Leo; he calls Amru'l-Keis ὁ Ἀμορκεσος του Νοκαλιου, and says that he had left the service of the Persians, had invaded western Arabia, and had made war on the Saracens, but not on the Romans. He had afterwards turned Christian, and sent a priest to Byzantium to solicit an alliance with the emperor.

Christian Arabs of Ghassan, persisted obstinately in his faith;[4] he opposed force to force, and the persecution of their bishops was the signal of revolt to the Arab tribes, who harassed the Syrian borders with their incursions.[5] The people of Hamyar and southern Arabia presented yearly petitions to the emperor for bishops to occupy their vacant sees, such as might be agreeable to the doctrines which they all professed, and who had not subscribed to the council of Chalcedon. But their ambassadors only returned with a refusal, and an earnest admonition that they should receive the bishop whom he had appointed for them, and who was then at Alexandria. But the Hamyarites chose rather to create bishops for themselves than submit to the arbitrary commands of those who, by the rules of the church, were alone capable of ordaining them. The assembled priests and clergy selected men out of their own order, constituted them bishops by the operation of cheirotony, or placing their hands on their heads,

[4] Asseman, tom. ii. pp. 326—331.

[5] The account of this invasion is given in Pococke, Spec. Hist. Arab. The cause of it is given by an Arabian writer in Asseman, tom. ii. p. 494. سبب الشقاق بين العرب والروم اضطهاد الملك يوسطينوس الابا القائلين بالطبيعة الواحدة لان نصاري العرب يومئذ انما كانوا يعتقدون اعتقاد اليعقوبية لا غير* "The cause of the dissension between the Arabs and the Romans was that the emperor Justin (Justinian) persecuted the Monophysite fathers; for the Christian Arabs at that time professed solely the Jacobite faith."

and agreed to pay them the same respect and obedience as though they had been created by the Alexandrian primate. But many were unwilling to admit the authority and legitimacy of bishops thus created, and the Christian power in Arabia Felix was weakened by its own divisions and dissensions. The defect of discipline was the cause of the introduction of innumerable schisms and heresies, amongst which, not the least was that of the Phantasianists or Julianists.[1] This sect originated in Syria,[2] and received its name from Julian of Halicarnassus, who was a great opposer of the synod of Chalcedon. His doctrines are characterised as a mixture of those of Eutyches, Apollinaris, Manes, and Eudoxius; they met with a favourable reception amongst some of the monks of Egypt, but were opposed by the Jacobites, and Julian himself was denounced by Severus as a most destructive dragon.[3] On the death of Procopius bishop of Ephesus, who had embraced the Phantasiast doctrines, seven priests of the same persuasion met together to choose another, who should take his place; and as there was no bishop of that sect to ordain him, having chosen one Eutropius, they consecrated him by placing on his head the hand of the dead bishop, and at the same time

[1] Jo. As. Episc. p. 44. (in the Syrische Chrestomathie of Michaelis).

[2] Takri-eddini Makrizii Hist. Copt. p. 75.

[3] Renaudot, Hist. Patr. Alex. pp. 132, 133.

reciting the formula of cheirotony. Eutropius being thus consecrated, ordained ten others, who were deputed to various parts of the east, to spread their doctrines. The first Phantasiast bishop of the Hamyarites was Sergius, who was succeeded on his death, four years afterwards, by a bishop of the name of Moses.[4]

The difference between the Romans and Arabs was further widened by an accidental circumstance. The Saracen chiefs were seldom included in the treaties of peace between Rome and Persia, and being at continual variance with each other, were often the cause of misunderstanding, and even of open war, between the two rival empires. At the time of the Persian embassy under Mebodes to the court of Justinian, Amrus, the Persian phylarch, made a demand on the emperor for a sum of money, which he alleged to be due to him for some service he had done for the empire.[5] On the refusal of Justi-

[4] Jo. As. Episc. ap. Asseman. tom. ii. The monks of Sinai appear at this time to have been Melchites, and perhaps this was the cause of their being exposed to the depredations of the Arabs, on which account Justinian built them a monastery.—Cum autem audiissent monachi montis Sinæ de bona imp. Justiniani intentione, quamque condendis ecclesiis et monasteriis struendis delectaretur, ad ipsum profecti, conquesti sunt Arabes Ismaelitas ipsis damnum inferre, penum ipsorum devorando, locaque diruendo, cellasque ingredientes, quicquid ibi esset diripere, et in ecclesias irruentes eucharistiam deglutire. Eutychius, tom. ii. p. 161. ex versione Pocock.

[5] Menander, excerp. Legat. p. 82, et seq.

nian to listen to his demands, the Arabian chief ordered his brother Kabus to invade the domains of the king of Ghassan,[1] which he immediately did, carrying away the camels and flocks of the Roman Arabs. In revenge, the king of Ghassan, Mondar the son of Hareth, as he is named, collected his forces, invaded Hirah, defeated Kabus, recovered his camels, and took also a rich booty. The king of Hirah again invaded the dominions of the Roman phylarch, but being defeated, he fled to the king of Persia. In expectation of an invasion by the united forces of Hirah and Persia, Mondar sent to the emperor, and represented to him his danger, requesting from his more powerful ally assistance to oppose the threatened attack. But Justinian wished to preserve the peace which then existed, and determined to get rid of his Saracen phylarch, as the only obstacle to the continued friendship between the courts of Byzantium and Persia. He wrote accordingly to Marcianus, his general, who was then encamped near Nisibis, directing him to invite the king of Ghassan to his camp, where he was to detain and put him to death. The emperor is reported to have dictated two letters, one to Marcianus, the other to Mondar, desiring him to go to Marcianus, who would communicate to him something of consequence, which could not be communicated by a letter. The scribe, when he had

[1] Id. p. 85.

written and sealed the letters, inscribed, by mistake, that which was intended for Marcianus with the name of Mondar, and that which should have gone to the king of Ghassan was directed to Marcianus. When, therefore, the Arabian chief read the orders of the emperor to his general, inflamed with rage, he made peace with the Persian Arabs, and joined them in the invasion of Syria, where they laid waste with fire and sword the whole country up to the walls of Antioch.[2]

On the accession of Tiberius, Mondar repaired to Constantinople, excused himself for his past conduct, shewed the emperor the letters of Justinian, and was again received with favour. The Arab chief, however, fell once more under suspicion, and a Syrian governor, named Magnes, under pretence of friendly converse, sent for him, threw him into chains, and carried him to Constantinople. Noman, his son, collected the Arabs of Ghassan, and invaded Syria, in revenge for the treacherous behaviour of the Byzantine court; but he narrowly escaped falling a victim to the same fraud which had twice been made use of towards his father, and afterwards was pardoned by Maurice, who liberated Mondar, on his swearing eternal friendship to the Romans, and enmity to the Persians.[3] When it was proposed to him to subscribe to the council of Chalcedon, he positively refused, alleging that all the Arab tribes

[2] Barhebræi Chronicon Syr. p. 90.

professed the *orthodox* faith, and that if he departed from it he should draw upon himself their enmity.[1]

[1] Barhebræus, pp. 92, 93. Evagrius says that both Mondar and his son Noman were in confinement in the time of Maurice, lib. vi. c. 2.

SECTION XI.

THE division of the northern tribes between the Persians and Romans, the overthrow of the ancient and once powerful kingdom of Hamyar, and the weakness of the Ethiopian government in the peninsula, had thrown the Arab states between Sabæa and the northern frontiers into a state of tumultuous anarchy. The various chiefs were perpetually at war with each other, and in these wars the powers of Hirah, of Ghassan, and of Yaman, became continually implicated. Their mutual hostilities were carried to such a height as to gain for them from one of their own poets the character of "men, like strong-necked lions, who menace one another with malignant hate, like the demons of Badiya, with feet firmly rivetted in the conflict."[2]

A quarrel about the swiftness of the favourite horses of their chiefs, which were named Dahes and Ghabra, gave rise to a war between the Absites and the Dzobijamites. From the first conflict, the day of Morkateb, which was fought at Dzu'l-Morkateb, a place in the district of Scharabah, and in which the Absites triumphed, to the battle of the marsh,

[2] Zohair, Moallakah, couplet 71.

which was followed by a truce, it lasted forty years.[1] This war ended about the period of the birth of Muhammed, during the reign of Amru ben Hind,[2] and was followed by many wars and battles between the Amerites, Ghafanidites, Absites, Keisites, and other tribes, which originated in as many petty, perhaps often imaginary, injuries.[3] Many of these conflicts took place within the bounds of the Roman and Persian provinces, and one is recorded to have happened at Ras-el-Ain, or Theodosiopolis, only fifteen farsangs, or forty-five miles, from Nisibis.[4]

The Taglabites, or Arabs of Ghassan, were always celebrated for their personal bravery.[5] Between

[1] Rasmussen, Hist. Præcip. Arab. Regn. pp. 83—88.

[2] Id. ib. p. 89.

[3] Id. pp. 89—110. The following may be cited as an instance of the trifling causes of these hostilities. "Dies Fagar secundus fuit inter Koreischitas et Havazenitas: juvenes nempe aliquot Koreischitæ mulieri cuidam e beni Amer ben Dsâdsâh (ﺻﻌﺼﻌﺔ) [Havazenitis] in foro Ocads consederunt. Complures subinde adolescentes Cananitæ eam circumdederunt, rogantes, ut vultum, velo demto, retegeret; quod cum negasset, aliquis eorum, a tergo subrepens, indusium ejus dorso spina affixit, unde factum, ut cum incauta surrexit, in conspectum data esset pars ejus postica. In risum effusi juvenes ei dixere: conspectum faciei tui nobis denegasti, sed conspicienda partem adversam nobis præbuisti. Convocavit in auxilium mulier tribules Ameritas, unde orta altercatio leviorque conflictio; mox tamen rem composuit Harb filius Omijah." Nuweir, in Rasmussen, p. 75.

[4] Rasmussen, p. 103.

[5] Vullers, Prolegom. ad Hareth, Moallaca, p. ii.

them and the Becrites, who were also a powerful tribe, including the tribes of Keis, Hanifah, Edschlah, and Lodschainah in Yamama and Hadramaut, and who had gained no less than eight victories in a war with the Tamimites,[6] a series of mutual enmities and jealousies had long existed. Of the origin of these animosities no certain account is given. The war of Basus, which ended just before Hogr the Kendite was made king of the Becrites, is said to have originated from a camel,[7] or, according to others, from a goose.[8] But it appears most probable that the chief cause of their hostilities was a quarrel about water, the most valuable article to a wandering Arab. Some of the tribe of Taglab, it seems, running short of water, applied for relief to the tribe of Becr, and on being refused, took arms, and obtained by force what had been denied to their entreaties.[9] After having exhausted each other by their mutual and continual struggles, they at length called in the mediation of Amru ben Hind, the king of Hirah, who reigned from about the sixty-third to the seventy-ninth years of the sixth century.[10] Of this event we have two authentic documents, the poetic addresses of the chiefs of the rival tribes, which deserved a place among the Moallaka that were suspended in the temple of Mecca.

Hareth was of the tribe of Becr, and his Moal-

[6] Rasmussen, p. 117, et seq. [7] Id. pp. 111, 115.
[8] Vuller, Prolegom. in Hareth. Moall. [9] Id. ib.
[10] 563 or 564 to 576 or 579, according to Rasmussen.

laka is addressed to the king of Hirah in defence of his countrymen. At the beginning he expatiates on the injuries which the Becrites had suffered from the tribe of Taglab, and launches out in praise of his own personal innocence and valour. He recounts the various battles in which the Taglabites had been defeated, and reminds Amru of the numerous occasions in which the Becrites had assisted the kings of Hirah. He refers also to the bravery of his tribe in the war between the Arabs of Yaman and the Maadites and descendants of Adnan, and lastly appeals to the Taglabites themselves, who were present, to acknowledge their innocence.[1]

The poet Amru ben Kelthûm was a chief of the tribe of Taglab, and had himself conquered the tribe of Temim, and had made war both on Hanifah and Hirah.[2] He was chosen to advocate the cause of the Taglabites before Amru at Hirah, and there repeated the Moallaka which bears his name. He answers the address of Hareth by celebrating the glory of his own tribe, and comparing their actions with those of the Becrites. He boasts of having assisted the tribe of Nesâr in the invasion of Yaman,[3]

[1] Hareth, Moallaca, ed. J. Vullers. 4to. Bon. 1827.

[2] Abu'l-farâdsch Ali, ap. Kosegarten, in Amrui ben Kelthûm Moallaca, p. 38. He was celebrated as an excellent poet, and composed much.

[3] Amru ben Kelthûm, Moallaca, coupl. 68. It has been published by G. L. Kosegarten, Jen. 1819. 4to. and translated by Sir W. Jones.

of having encamped in Syria at Dzu Tholûch, at Baalbec, and at Damascus, and even at Kâsarûn in Persian Irak, and of having repelled every attempt of his enemies to drive him away.[4] "We severed their heads," he says, "and made them bow their necks;[5] none ever knew us dejected or retreating."[6] The judgment of the king of Hirah was perhaps guided by partiality and interest; but the violent spirit of Amru was incapable of bearing what he considered to be an injury, and he slew the king in his own palace, and hastened with his attendants to the Syrian desert.[7]

Amongst the numerous poets who flourished at this period are recorded the names of Ascha and Nabega.[8] Ascha was a *Kadarite*, or professor of

Finximus tentoria nostra Dsutholûchi
Ad Syriam usque, et repulimus minantes. coupl. 28.
Sæpius pocula exhausi Baalbeki,
Aliaque Damasci et Kâsserûni. coupl. 7.

Kâsserûni is, according to Meninski, Kasserûn in Persian Irak, or the province of Fars, which is mentioned by Sir W. Ouseley, (Travels, vol. i. p. 271) as a place founded by Kobad, or perhaps earlier. It was noted in the time of the Arabian geographers for the number of its fire temples. Kosegarten, de Mohammede Ebn Batuta, p. 31.

[5] Findimus illis capita agminis findendo,
Demetunt colla, ita ut succidantur. coupl. 38.

[6] Ohe, non cognoverunt gentes nos
Abjectos unquam neque torpentes. coupl. 58.

[7] Kœsegarten, Amrui Moallac. p. 39. His violence came into a proverb—"Violentior Amruo ben Kelthûm."

[8] A learned Arab being asked who was the best Arabian

the doctrine of free will, which he is said to have learnt from the Christians of Hirah.[1] He was descended from Adnan,[2] and wrote in the reign of Khosroës Parviz, and his poem, in which he praises his mistress, and bids defiance to his enemies, was suspended in the Kaaba, where it remained till the capture of Mecca by Muhammed.[3] Ascha was concerned in several quarrels between the Arab tribes, and was once taken prisoner and confined in the castle of Ablak, but he contrived to make his escape.[4]

The mondar who succeeded Amru ben Hind, Noman abu Kabus, who reigned at Hirah from the year 589 to 611,[5] is said to have embraced Christianity.[6] The progress, even the existence, of Christianity in the kingdom of Hirah, seems to have been always uncertain and inconstant, as it was dependent on the character and policy of the king, or rather on that of his master, the Khosroës of Persia. Christian bishops, however, were stationed there, at Hirah

poet, said, "Amru'l-Kais when he is in a rage; Nabega when under the influence of fear; Zohair, when under that of desire; Ascha, when he is transported with joy." Abul-faradj, in the Fundgruben des Orients, band v. p. 1.

[1] Silvester de Sacy, ibid.

[2] Eichhorn, Monum. Ant. Hist. p. 137.

[3] This poem was edited by de Sacy, in the Fundgruben des Orients, band v. with an introduction and translation.

[4] Fundgruben des Orients, band v. p. 3.

[5] Id. band ii. p. 37.

[6] Id. ib. Evagrius, lib. vi. c. 22. Pococke, Spec. Hist. p. 75.

and at Kufa. Christianity is said to have been first carried into this part of Arabia by a monk, about the year 363.[7] A king of Hirah is mentioned as having been converted in the beginning of the sixth century, and as having built several churches in various parts of his dominions.[8] Noman abu Kabus is said to have been led to embrace the religion of Jesus by his admiration of the constancy and punctuality of a Syrian Christian, whom he had designed to put to death. In a fit of drunkenness he had wantonly killed two of his friends, and when sober, in repentance for his cruelty, and in remembrance of their friendship, he erected tombs over their graves, and vowed to moisten them once every year with the blood of an enemy. One of the first victims intended for the fulfilment of his vow was this Christian of Syria, who entreated the mondar to allow him a short space of time to return home, for the purpose of acquitting himself of some duty with which he had been entrusted; and the boon was granted on his solemn promise to return at an appointed time. The time came and he was punctual to his word, and thus saved his life.[9] Noman abu Kabus proved the sincerity of his conversion by melting down a statue of Venus, of solid gold, which had been worshipped by his tribe, and by distributing

[7] Fundgruben des Orients, band ii. p. 360.

[8] Abulfeda, ap. Pococke, p. 75.

[9] Pococke, ibid. Fundgruben des Orients, band iii. p. 38.

the produce amongst the poor.[1] Many Saracens of Hirah followed his example, and were baptized.

[1] Τοτε και Νααμανης των εκθρων Σκηνητων φυλαρχος, εξαγιστος και παμμιαγος Ἑλλην (*i.e.* a pagan), ὡς και ανθρωπους αυτοχειρι σφαγιαζειν τοις αυτου δαιμονιοις, τῳ αγιῳ προσηλθε βαπτισματι, την οντως ολην χρυσην Αφροδιτην πυρ τηξας, και πτωχοις διαδους, και παντας τους αμφ' αυτου τῳ θεῳ προσαγαγων. Evagrius, lib. vi. c. 22. This account agrees remarkably with that of the Arabian writers.

SECTION XII.

Of the reign of Yecsoum, the son and successor of Abrahah, the page of history has not preserved a single particular. His mother was of the ancient royal family of Hamyar. Arabian writers declaim against his cruelties and tyrannic oppressions of the people, which drove many to seek protection from the tribe of Koreish, whose victory over his predecessor had raised them to importance among the Arabian tribes.[2] The only Greek writer who mentions him, and whose authority may be doubted, calls him Serdius, and informs us that he resembled his father in justice and piety.[3]

When the chiefs of Hamyar saw that the dominion of the Abyssinian conquerors continued, and that the crown of their country descended in regular succession through a family whom they considered as usurpers, and whose treatment of their subjects caused them now to be regarded as tyrants, they began to conspire for their expulsion. The last of the old royal race of Hamyar was Seif, the son of Dzu

[2] Tabeir, p. 126. Mesoud, p. 144. Conf. Abulfeda, Hamza, and Nuweir.

[3] Παρειληφη δε Σερδιος ὁ υἱος αυτου τα σκηπτρα της βασιλειας, και ην κατα παντα ὡς ὁ πατηρ αυτου, τῳ μακαριῳ Γρηγεντιῳ ἑπομενος. Gregent. Taphr. Episc. disputat. cum Herbano Jud., p. 204.

Jezen. At the instigation of the Arabian nobles, who furnished him with money and other necessaries for his journey, Seif repaired to Constantinople to implore the assistance of the emperor in delivering his country from the Abyssinian yoke. He was liberally received by Maurice,[1] and is reported to have waited in patient expectation at the Byzantine court for some time,[2] but he was at length told that unity of faith prevented the emperor of the Romans from being hostile to the Abyssinian nadjash. Disappointed in his hopes, the Arabian prince left Constantinople and went to Hirah, where he was kindly received by Noman ibn Mondar, who offered to introduce him to the Persian monarch. Accordingly, Seif accompanied the king of Hirah soon after to the court of the Khosroës.

When Seif had obtained an audience of Noushirwan, after having gone through the accustomed ceremonies of adoration to the great king,[3] he de-

[1] The Arabians say it was Heraclius, but the Greeks are in this respect better authority. See Theophylact. Symocatta, Hist. Byzant. lib. iii. c. 8.

[2] Seven years سبعم سنين according to Mesoud, p. 144.

[3] "The Khosroës was accustomed," says the Arabian historian, "to give audience in a portico, in which his crown, which was as large as a great medimnus, and was composed of hyacinths, emeralds, pearls, gold, and silver, was suspended from the roof by a chain of gold, for the neck of the king was not able to sustain so great a weight. He was covered with a veil until he sat down and placed his head in this crown. Thus when he had ascended, and was sitting on the throne, the veil

clared the purpose of his embassy, represented the state of his country, which was suffering under the tyranny of the Abyssinians, shewed the advantage which the Persians would derive by the recovery of Yaman from the Christians, and called on their relationship, the relationship that always exists between people of the same colour and of much the same religion, in opposition to a race of dark Ethiopian Christians, as a sufficient claim on his assistance. But the king, deterred by the distance of Hamyar from Persia, and having his attention occupied by a series of continual wars in other parts, expressed his unwillingness to undertake any enterprise of which the resulting advantages might be doubtful. He declared that he would not risk a Persian army for a barren country, whose only riches were sheep and camels, and dismissed the Arabian prince with a present of ten thousand pieces of gold. No sooner had Seif left the royal presence, than he distributed the whole of the king's present among the crowd of slaves and other people whom he met in the street. The Khosroës, when informed of this transaction, ordered Seif to be brought before him, and demanded the reason of his strange conduct. The answer was at once calculated to excite the cupidity and compassion of Noushirwan. "What need," said he, "have I of the riches of Khosroës, when the very mountains of my own country are nothing

was removed, but none were allowed to look on him till they had fallen down and worshipped him." Tabeir, p. 128.

but silver and gold? I came to the king not for wealth, but for deliverance from oppression and insult." The king was moved by his words and appearance, and promised to take his affairs into consideration.

By the advice of his ministers, Noushirwan, we are told, armed all the malefactors who filled his prisons, amounting to three thousand and six hundred men. These were placed under the command of Wehraz, a Persian noble. They landed, accompanied by Seif Dzi Jezen, on the coast of Hadramaut, at a place called Maijoun, and their forces were quickly swelled by the partisans of Seif, and by those who had suffered from the oppressions of the Abyssinian king of Hamyar, Mesrouk, the brother of Yecsoum, and son of Abrahah, to twenty thousand men. Intelligence of this formidable host soon reached the ears of Mesrouk, who prepared to oppose the invader with a powerful army. When they were on the point of engaging, Wehraz, we are told, desired Seif to point out to him the king of Hamyar; the latter was then seated on an elephant, and from his crown a red hyacinth was suspended by a golden chain over his forehead, between his eyes. Whilst the Persian was looking at him, he descended from his elephant and mounted a camel; soon afterwards, he changed the camel for a horse, then descended on foot, and last of all mounted a mule. "Thus," said Wehraz, "shall perish his kingdom, it shall be debased as he is debased." Thereupon he

seized an arrow, and aimed it at the hyacinth which glittered on the monarch's brow, directing his attendants, when they saw Mesrouk fall, to commence the attack on his army. The arrow of Wehraz reached its destination, the king of Hamyar was slain, and the Abyssinian army, confounded by the death of their leader, made but a feeble resistance. After the defeat and death of the Abyssinian king, Seif was placed on the throne of Hamyar, as the vassal and tributary of Noushirwan, and all the Abyssinians that were found in Yaman were either put to death or reduced to slavery.[1]

On the arrival of Seif at Sanaa, the capital of the kingdom of his forefathers, his return was welcomed by the Arabian chiefs, and the regal hall of the Gamadan, or palace of the kings of Hamyar, re-

[1] Nuweir, p. 96. Mesoud, pp. 146—148. According to the latter it was Maadi-Carb, the son of Seif, who was assisted by Noushirwan; Seif himself having died in Persia. The invasion of Hamyar by the Persians is briefly related by a Greek historian, who calls Wehraz, Mêranês—Διο και ὁ Κοσροης επ' Αιθιοπας, φιλους οντας Ρωμαιοις, τους παλαι μεν Μακροβιους, νυν δε 'Ομηριτας καλουμενους, εστρατευσε· και τον βασιλεα των 'Ομηριτων Σανατουρκην, δια Μηρανους του Περσων στρατηγου εζωγρησε· την τε πολιν αυτων εξεπορθησε, και το εθνος παρεστησατο. Theophanes Byzant. ap. Phot. Biblioth. no. lxiv. p. 79. The history is also recorded in the Persian historians; see, for example, Ommia Jahhia Ad-Ullatifi fil. Lubb-It Tavarich, Hist. Pers. in Büschings Magazin für die neue Historie und Geographie, band xvii. pp. 40, 41, and Nikbi ben Massoud, in the Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque du Roi, tom. ii. p. 340.

sounded with festivity.[1] Then the poet Ommia Ibn Abisselt recited before the nobles his poem in praise of their deliverer, in which he described the long and perilous expedition which he had undertaken in their cause, and the hardships and disappointments he had suffered in soliciting the aid, first of the emperor of the Romans, and afterwards of the king of Persia, and finally he celebrated the invasion of Yaman, and the bravery of Wehraz.[2]

Amongst the Arabian chiefs who came to congratulate the new king of Hamyar, was Abdolmotalleb ibn Hasjemi, the prince of the Koreish, who expressed the greatest joy on the occasion, addressed him as "the head of all the Arabians, as their *spring* from whence originated all their prosperity, their leader, and the pillar on which they all depended;"[3]

[1] Abulfeda, p. 12.

وحوينا باد قحطان قسرا
ثم سرنا الي ذري غمدن ۞
فنعمنا به بكل سرور
وبنينا علي نسا قحطان ۞

And having gained by our arms the region of Kehtan,
We next penetrated into the palace of Gamada;
And then we indulged in joy and pleasure,
And we contracted marriages with the Kehtan women.
Poeta ap. Mesoud, p. 150.

[2] Abulfeda, p. 12, who gives part of the poem. It is also given, with some little variation, by Mesoud (p. 154), who attributes it to Abu Zemaa, of whom Ommia was a descendant.

[3] "Caput es Arabum, eorumque Ver, per quem læta copia abundent: Arabum quoque eminens Vertex, cui se ducendos tradunt; itemque Columna, super quam recumbatur."

and reminded him of the glory of his ancestors, and of the lofty station to which he had attained. The king embraced him as his kinsman, and in the course of their conversation, Abdolmotalleb informed him of the coming of the prophet, and of the purpose of his mission.[4]

From amongst the captive Abyssinians, Seif had, on his accession, chosen a certain number as his own attendants and guards. These, having determined to revenge the sufferings of their enslaved countrymen, seized an opportunity, when they were attending the king to Sanaa, and suddenly rushing on him put him to death with their spears, after a reign of four years. When they had effected their purpose, the conspirators found refuge in the mountains, and the murder was retaliated on all their countrymen who were so unfortunate as to be found in Sanaa.[5] Seif was the last native king of Hamyar; after his death the kingdom was governed by Persian viceroys, the first of whom was the same Wehraz who had recovered it from the Abyssinians. He was followed in succession by Sigian, Howraz, Nousisjan, Hersjhir, and Bâdsân, who governed Yaman under Khosroës Parviz, at the time when Muhammed was by dint of arms converting the northern tribes to Islam.[6]

[4] Mesoud, pp. 152, 154.

[5] Mesoud, p. 156. Tabeir, p. 134.

[6] Mesoud, ib. Tabeïr, p. 136. Hamza, p. 45. Abulefda, p. 16.

SECTION XIII.

THE same year which had witnessed the defeat of the Christian power in Arabia by the idolaters of Mecca, about two months after that event,[1] and whilst Abrahah still occupied the throne of Yaman,[2] gave birth to one of the greatest enemies the church has ever experienced. The grandfather of Muhammed was the same Abdolmotalleb who had opposed the arms of Abrahah, who was not only the chief of the tribe of Koreish, but appears to have been related to the royal family of Hamyar.[3] The history of Muhammed prior to his assumption of the character of a prophet is exceedingly obscure, perhaps we may venture to say entirely unknown. The earliest Arabian writers who have composed his life lived at least some centuries after the events they relate;[4]

[1] Five and fifty nights after بخمس وخمسين ليلة according to Nuweir, p. 92, that is, he adds, بعد عشرين سنة من ملك انوشروان in the twentieth year of the reign of Noushirwan.

[2] Hamza, p. 40.

[3] When he went to congratulate Seif Dzi Jezen on his restoration to the crown of Hamyar, Seif demanded who he was. "I am," said he, "Abdolmotalleb, the son of Hashem, the son of Abd Menáf." "Then," said the king, "you are the son of our brother," ابن اخينا Mesoud, p. 152.

The Sonna, which is the chief source of the Arabian his-

and the evident absurdity of the greater part of their anecdotes is sufficient to justify us in rejecting the whole. One portion was most likely invented by the impostor himself, the other, perhaps the greater, was the work of his followers.[5] Amongst the igno-

tories of Muhammed, was not compiled within two or three centuries of the time in which he lived. Abulfeda, who is the best authority, was king of Hamah, and was born in the year 672 of the Hégira, and died in 733. The Greek historians who were nearly contemporary with Muhammed, give no particulars of his life. Nicephorus, who was born about A.D. 758, and wrote the Byzantine history from the death of Maurice, does not give any account of Muhammed, but says that A.D. 631, the Saracens broke out from Æthribus (Αἰθριβου—Yatreb) a region of Arabia Felix, and invaded the surrounding regions, (p. 15,) and that in 634 they invaded the district of Antioch, and committed many atrocities, but were defeated. (p. 16.) At pp. 17, 18, he gives a brief history of the invasion of Syria by Omar. The later writers, Theophanes, Zonaras, Euthymius, &c. have taken all they say of him from Saracen information.

[5] The following may be taken as a tolerable specimen of their compositions—Un jour Abdo'llah (the father of Muhammed) raconta à son père un miracle des plus surprenans: "ô mon père," dit-il, "après m'être promené dans le champ des cailloux de la Mecque, comme j'étois au haut du mont Yatreb, il sortit incontinent de mon dos deux lumières, dont l'une s'eleva vers l'orient, et l'autre vers l'occident. En même tems ces deux lumières, après avoir fait dans l'air plusieurs cercles, entrelacés l'un dans l'autre, se rejoignirent ensemble en forme d'une nuée subtile et raréfiée, qui s'envolant vers le ciel, y entra et disparut à mes yeux: Un moment après, cette nuée sortit du ciel, elle ce rapprocha de moi en un clein d'œil; et comme je m'assis au même lieu, saisi d'étonnement, j'entendis une voix, comme sortant de dessous moi, et qui me dit: *Paix soit à toi, ô Abdo'llah, dans le dos du quel est renfermée la lumière Mahomed.*

rant and superstitious every uncommon event is full of mystery and terror, an ominous intimation of the events of futurity, and thus the revolutions of comets drag with them those of kingdoms and empires, and every meteor or planetary motion is the precursor of misery, of famine, or of massacres. Abundance of such inauspicious appearances, if we believe the historians of the time, announced the coming of the future scourge of Rome and Persia. The hour which gave him birth extinguished the eternal fires on the idolatrous altars of Persepolis:[1] and at the same time fourteen towers of the royal palace of Noushirwan at Modaïne (Al Madayn) fell with a terrible crash, portending by their downfall that of the empire of the Khosroës.[2] The confidential minister of the Persian king, Al Mûbedhân, in addition to these prodigies, dreamt that he saw his camel beaten by an Arabian horse, and that the

Puis m'étant avancé çà et là en quelque lieu sec et aride pour m'y asseoir, sous quelqu'arbre, l'herbe et l'arbre reverdissaient, l'arbre même recourbait sur moi ses branches; et quand je m'en éloignais, la terre où il était planté semblait se mouvoir vers moi, pour me congratuler. Gagnier, Vie de Moham. tom. i. p. 63.

[1] Sir W. Ouseley, Travels in Pers. vol. ii. Abulfeda, Vit. Moham. p. 3.

[2]

وبات ايوان كسري وهو منصدع
كشمل اصحاب كسري غير ملتئم ۞

"And the portico of Kisra (Khosroës) became broken, as also the friends of Kisra were not in unity." Abu Abdallæ carmen mysticum Borda dictum, ed. Uria, 4to. Traj. 1771, complet 61, &c. See also Abulfed. Vit. Moham. p. 3. (ed. Gagn.)

river Tigris had overflowed its bounds. The minister of Noushirwan, we are told, was endowed with the faculty of divination, and in the morning he compared his dream with the other events of the night, and was enabled to inform the terrified monarch that some new and unexpected danger was impending from the quarter in which Arabia lay. The king immediately conferred with Al Nomân, the king of Hirah, by whose advice he deputed Abdo'l-Masihun, an Arab of the tribe of Ghassan, to make strict inquiries throughout the peninsula.[3] Such were the events which, according to the Arabian writers, preceded the coming of their prophet. But part of the Persian palace might have fallen, or the sacred fires might have been unexpectedly extinguished, had Muhammed never been born.

From his birth to his fortieth year, Muhammed is said to have been educated, and to have lived, in the sinful and idolatrous manners of his fellow-countrymen.[4] Part of the intervening period he is reported to have spent in Syria, but in what manner may be considered as somewhat uncertain.[5] His

[3] Abulfeda, de Vit. Moham. ibid. Abu Abdallah, p. 25. Gagnier, Vie de Mahomet, tom. i. p. 79.

[4] Maracci, Prodrom. pp. 10, 16.

[5] The oriental accounts of his mercantile life, and his expeditions to Bostra and Damascus, are very little to be depended upon. I am not aware of one contemporary or nearly contemporary writer who mentions them, and if known to the Christian writers, they would certainly have taken advantage of them in their controversial writings. Michael Febure, in his Teatro della

usurpation of the title of a prophet of God was doubtlessly a plot which had been maturely formed, and his expectations of its ultimate success were entirely grounded on the political state of the age. He had watched with no eye of unconcern the two great rival empires tearing each other to pieces, and he had ventured from the first to promise his followers the plunder of the treasures of Khosroës and of Cæsar.[1] He saw how readily the Arabs of the north embraced the new faith of the Christians, and he doubted not that a new religion, formed agreeable to their character, and seconded by the pretence of a divine mission, would be equally successful among the Arabs of the interior. His first attempts, which were made on his own family and relations, were enforced by dint of persuasion and deception. When, however, he began to make public his pretensions, he met with greater opposition than perhaps he had expected; the Koreish were bigotted to their old idola-

Turchia, says that Muhammed was a soldier in the army of Heraclius, and that he had deserted, and afterwards, with the assistance of Sergius, had raised a rebellion in Arabia. It would be curious to know what was his authority. If such had been the case, Muhammed would not fail to conceal it, and in the state in which Arabia was, few or none would be likely to know whether in Syria he had acted the part of a soldier or a merchant. See Maracci, p. 36.

[1] Afterwards, in expressing their discontent, some of his followers complained—"promittebat nobis Mohammed fore, ut Kesræ et Cæsaris thesauros devoraremus." Abulfed. Vit Moham. p. 76.

trous creed, and the Christians and Jews would do all in their power to set their minds against him. His persuasions were treated with contempt, his threats were resented with violence, and his followers were obliged to seek refuge from persecution in Ethiopia, and himself, with some of his most faithful partisans, at the city of Yatreb or Medina.[2]

In his prophetic character, Muhammed had hitherto affected to profess the meek humility of that Jesus, whose ministry he pretended that he was come to supersede, aud declared that it was not the will of God that his worship should be propagated by force.[3] But change of power brought with it change of principles. He had now gained a band of followers, and became in every sense a robber, a bandit, an enemy of all around him; a year or two brought about another change, and he became a conqueror. To recount the predatory exploits of the prophet and his followers against the various tribes around Medina, would but be wearisome to the reader:[4] within eight years after his flight, Muhammed was solemnising the festival of the Ramadhân at Kodaïd, on his way to the conquest of Mecca.[5] The Koraish were terror-struck at his

[2] Abulfeda, de Vit. Moham. c. xi. p. 23, &c.

[3] Koran, Sura 2.

[4] The exploits of Muhammed from the *hegira*, or flight, to the conquest of Mecca, are given compendiously by Gibbon, and in detail by Gagnier and Abulfeda.

[5] Gagnier, Vie de Mahomet, tom. ii. p. 114. Kodaïd is de-

unexpected approach, and the city was quickly delivered into his hands.

Muhammed was sensible that by acquiring possession of the sacred city he had not secured the affections of the Koreish; but by an affected show of clemency he hoped to banish hatred and distrust from their minds. The keys of the Kaaba were delivered to him by Otham; but he returned them to their former possessor, who either won by his clemency, or awed by his sword, embraced the faith of the conqueror.[1] Khalid was severely reprimanded for permitting the slaughter of eight and twenty of the Koreish, and a general pardon was extended to the whole tribe, with the exception of six men and four women, who had been notorious for their hatred to the doctrines and person of the prophet. The penitence, however, or rather the riches and influence, of Hobar ibn al Aswad, who had been his personal enemy, procured his pardon, and he was informed that Islamism had the power of effacing and abolishing all past offences.[2] Amongst the Celtic inhabitants of ancient Britain, the bards had a predominating influence over the mind of the prince and his warriors, and it is pretended that they roused the resentment of the English king Edward, as being the greatest obstacle to his conquests. A similar influence was enjoyed by the poets of the turbu-

scribed by Al Edrisi, as a place between Medina and Mecca, seventy miles from the latter, and five from the sea.

[1] Gagnier, tom. ii. p. 131. [2] Id. ib.

lent tribes of Arabia, and several, who had drawn on themselves the wrath of the conqueror by the bitterness of their invectives against him, were included among the number of the proscribed.[3] The poet Achsa had made verses in honour of Muhammed, and was once on his way to visit him, but the Koreish, fearing lest his verses might encourage the Arabs to fight in the cause of their enemy, prevailed on him to return.[4] Chofah ibn Nadijah, another poet of celebrity, was slain in the war between Muhammed and his native tribe.[5] Caab ben Zohair, as well as his father Zohair, were among the most celebrated of the Arabian bards, and belonged to the family of Kais Ghilan, of the tribe of the Masenites. His grandfather, uncle, and many of his kinsmen, had also excelled in the same art.[6] Muhammed considered that the same talents which had been exerted against him, might be equally efficacious when employed in his service; their conversion procured them a share in the pardon,[7] and the clemency of the prophet was rewarded with a poem by Caab composed in his praise.[8] This piece of flattery appears to have had its desired effect, and the son of

[3] Gagnier, tom. ii. p. 207.

[4] Fundgruben des Orients, band v. pp. 3, 4.

[5] Rasmussen, Hist. Præcip. Arab. regn. p. 93.

[6] Freytag, prologus in Carmen Caabi ben Sohair, p. xii. xiii.

[7] Gagnier, tom. iii. p. 207.

[8] The original Arabic of this poem, with a Latin version, has been edited in 4to. by Freytag, under the title of Caabi ben Sohair carmen in laudem Mohammedis dict. cum carm. Motenabbi et carmine ex Hamasa. Hal. 1823.

Zohair was rewarded by the gift of Muhammed's own cloak.[1] The poets Amru'l-Kais[2] and Lebid were also amongst the enemies of the new religion, but the latter changed his opinions on reading one of the chapters of the Koran which had been suspended on the walls of the Kaaba, and Muhammed gloried in his conversion.[3] His example was followed among others by the poet Alhothaijah, who afterwards deserted and relapsed into his former opinions.[4]

The year which made Muhammed master of Mecca, may be considered as that which established the religion of Islam, and the empire of the Saracens. The greater part of the Arabian tribes had been expecting in silence the issue of the contest; the possession of the Kaaba had made the Koreish the most powerful of the independent tribes, and their fall was speedily followed by the subjugation of the rest. Embassies and deputations crowded from all quarters seeking the protection and favour of the victor, and the Giadamites, and some few others, were solitary instances of opposition.[5]

[1] Caab filius Zoheir, cui, quamvis sibi infesto, ob elegantissimum epigramma in laudem suam conscriptum, *lacernam propriam* donavit. Maracci, Vit. Moham. p. 28.

[2] Amru'l-Kais wrote satires against Mohammed. D'Herbelot, Bibliothèque Orientale, in *Amru'l-Kais*.

[3] Peiper, Dissertat. de Moallaka Lebidi, p. 13.

[4] Freytag, prolog. in carmen Caabi ben Sohair, p. xiv.

[5] Al Bochanu, ap. Gagnier, not. in Abulfed. p. 111. Gagnier, Vie de Moham. tom. ii. p. 154.

When we contemplate with impartiality the character of Muhammed, we must be convinced that he was a man of superior natural abilities to most of his contemporary countrymen. The influence, however, which he obtained over his disciples, was in most cases the effect of the lowest species of cunning, working on an ignorant class of people. His enterprise was begun and carried through under the pompous title of a divine mission, and its authority was supported by documents which he asserted to have been an immediate communication of the Deity, and which his own affected ignorance of writing and reading satisfied them were not his own. These documents collected together formed the Koran, that mass of wild and unmeaning matter, which has been received so devoutly by his followers.[6]

[6] Vix dici potest, quid determinate contineat Alcoranus: est enim miscella et farrago innumerarum rerum. Maracci, p. 34. The German translator of Mosheim, J. A. Christoph von Einem, imagined that the work which now bears this name is not the real Koran of Mohammed. Das Buch, welches von den Mahumedaner der *Koran* genennt wird, bestehet aus verschiedenen Papieren und Reden, die Man nach seinem Tode gefunden und gesammlet hat, und ist nicht das achte Gesetz, dessen Vortrflichkeit Muhammed selbst so sehr erhebt. Veilleicht lieset Man einige Stükke des wahren Korans in dem heutigen Koran: dass aber der eigentliche Korân, oder das von Muhammed den Arabern vorgeschriebene Gesetz, von Muhammed selbst in unserm Koran auf seinen wahren Koran sich beruft, und ihn lobt. Ein Buch, welches in einem andern Buche empfohlen und gelobt wird, das muss von dem Buche, in welchem es gelobt wird, unterschieden sein. (not. in Mosheim, band iii. pp. 221, 292.)

If we consult the opinions of the Moslem on the subject of the Koran, we shall find them as unintelligible and incoherent as the work itself. One tells us that it contains sixty thousand miracles ;[1] another that it is itself a miracle greater even than that of raising the dead to life ;[2] and all true believers were compelled to acknowledge that it was uncreate, and had been in existence long before the creation of the world.[3] When we turn to the Christian writers, we find many of their opinions equally inconsistent, and scarcely more satisfactory ;[4] but presuming on this reputed ignorance of the impostor, they have generally agreed in assigning to him at least an assistant in its composition. Muhammed himself complains that on their first publication, some had attributed his Korans to human authority, and even intimates that a stranger was the object of their suspicions, and the argument by which he repels the

But H. von Einem does not appear to have considered that each *Sura* was originally a separate Koran, and therefore that one Koran might without impropriety be mentioned and extolled in another.

[1] Al Janabi, ap. Maracci, Vit. Moham. p. 43.

[2] Ahmed ibn Abdolhalim, ibid. [3] Maracci, p. 44.

[4] Maracci piously thinks that it may be the production of the devil, who appeared to Muhammed in the shape of an angel. Est enim locutio Alcoranica valde similis illi qua utuntur *dæmones* in energumenis, vel arreptitiis, vel quando se ab hominibus audiri sinunt. (p. 41). Maracci lived in a superstitious age, and we must pardon his want of judgment, and excuse his credulity.

charge is calculated to convince no one but a Mussulman.[5] The generality of the Arabian commentators are agreed that the person suspected was a Greek, or at least, a Christian.[6] That others were concerned in his plans, and assisted him perhaps by publishing his miracles, we may easily believe; but the legends of Bohira, or Sergius, are obscure, absurd, and therefore improbable.[7]

[5] "We know indeed that they already say—truly a man teacheth him: but the language of him whom they suspect is a barbarous language, and this is pure Arabic عربي مبين." Koran, Sur. 16. § 100.

[6] Maracci, p. 37.

[7] On Muhammed's first journey to Bostra, they tell us, a certain *learned* monk, called Bohira, or Sergius, or according to others, Caab, met him, and declared that he was destined by God to be his prophet, that he had read prophecies of him in the evangelists and in the prophets, and that he had a book, which was written in the time of Christ, and which related entirely to Muhammed, and contained his whole history. Maracci, p. 13. The words of the Koran afford indisputable testimony that some one was suspected of assisting Muhammed, and that he was a stranger; by comparing this with the legends of Bohira, I think it not improbable that some such Christian was an accomplice with him, and that he was employed in spreading reports of his sanctity, and in publishing false prophecies of his mission. The Arabic and Christian legends may be consulted in Maracci, pp. 35, 36; Gagnier, tom. i. p. 79; Abulpharagius, in the Arabic edition of Pococke, p. 162; Sale, Preliminary Discourse, § 2; Prideaux, who supposes him to have been a Jew. Euthymius says that the doctrines of Muhammed were composed of the dogmata of the Nestorians, Arians, and Jews. Maomethica, pp. 537, 552, in the Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum, tom. xii.

The Arabian writers have improved upon the asserted ignorance of Muhammed; and it has become a fundamental principle of belief that he could neither read nor write a single letter.[1] This, combined with the pure and elegant language in which they agree that the Koran is not only unequalled, but that it is utterly impossible to equal it, is one of their great arguments for its divine extraction. But those who have most obstinately defended the ignorance of Muhammed, contrasted with the elegance of the Koran, with a view of depriving him of the credit of its composition, have not contemplated the state of literature in Arabia at the time of his appearance, or considered what might, under his peculiar circumstances, bear such a denomination. The time of his birth was the golden age of Arabian literature, for it was during the reign of Amru ben Hind at Hirah, who was contemporary with the greatest of the Arabian poets.[2] Under the despotic government of the khalifs the Arabs might be more celebrated for their learning, for their skill in astrology, in grammar, in geography, or in the more abstruse science of geometry and numbers, but taste and purity of language belonged only to

[1] Chardin, Voyages en Perse, tom. iv. p. 33. A Persian poet cited by d'Herbelot in *Mohammed*, speaking of the prophet, says —"Mon bien-aimé n'a jamais été a l'écôle et n'a jamais sçu écrire une seule ligne, et cependant il sçait resoudre, d'un seul clin d'œil, toutes les plus grandes difficultés." p. 649.

[2] Maracci, Vit. Muham. p. 10.

their free ancestors of the ages which preceded the reign of Islam. As the writers of the age of fallen Greece employed their talents in writing scholia on the pure writers of past times, so the learned Saracens could only recite and explain the works of the illiterate writers who preceded them, without possessing the power to imitate them. The poets of Arabia, like the bards of the west, were not shackled by minute and crippling rules of composition, their works were the spontaneous productions of their imagination, and perhaps they might disdain the servile task of perpetuating their effusions by the use of writing. At least we may suppose that skill in writing was no proof of a liberal education, as among their descendants it has generally been the business of more servile minds.[3] The genius of Muhammed might equal that of any of his contemporaries,[4] and it would be quite sufficient to produce the Koran, although he were unable to write at all.

The poet Lebid, the last of the seven authors of the Moallakat, pretended to be converted to the religion

[3] An illustration of this may be found in the travels of D'Arvieux in Arabia.

[4] Muhammed war ein Genie, er fühlte das Schöne, doch misglückte ihm aus grosser Unkunde das Nachamen, und nur von selbst brachen bisweilen durch seine ungelehrte Erziehung eigenthümliche Funchen des Schönen hervor. Michaelis, Review of Boysen's Koran, in the Orientalische Bibliothek, band viii. p. 75.

of Muhammed, by reading a single passage out of the second Sura of the Koran. He had suspended his own poem in the Kaaba to challenge competition; on his return he found the passage from the Koran which Muhammed had placed by the side of it; he read it, instantly withdrew his own, and declared that no one was able to write such elegant language without divine inspiration. The passage is still extant, and is considered one of the most beautiful in the Koran, but it does not answer the expectations which we might be led to form, and speaks less to the credit of Muhammed, than it evinces the bad taste of Lebid.[1] The language of these vaunted revelations is not more calculated to strike with conviction than the matter they contain. Had the people been more civilized, the clumsiness of Muhammed's miracles must in themselves have frustrated his purposes. But the monks, who in this kind of argument were not inferior to himself, had paved the way, the angel Gabriel most providentially forbade discussion or controversy, and the swords of his associates effected the rest. He knew that his religion was weak in spiritual strength, and he called upon his people to defend it with the strength of their arms.

[1] The language of the Koran, and the history of Lebid, is discussed at length by Michaelis, in the *Vorrede* to his German edition of the Arabic Grammar of Erpenius.

There were three classes of people in Arabia whom it was Muhammed's wish to conciliate,—the Koreish and other tribes who were idolaters — the Christians— and the Jews.[2] The conversion of the Koreish was always the first object of his desire. The possession of the Kaaba would give him an influence over that vast number of pilgrims who yearly repaired to it; he changed indeed the name but not the form of their rites, and the idolatrous worshippers of its idols continued to encompass it with their steps in the name of the prophet.[3] When he entered Mecca as a conqueror, he gave immediate orders for the destruction of its idols, but he appeased their exasperated adorers by his extravagant tales of the sanctity of their abode. He declared to them that the place was the immediate choice of God;[4] that the same day in which the Almighty had created the heaven and the earth, he had

[2] "Truly, those who believe, and those who are Jews, and the Christians, and the Sabæans, whoever will believe in God and in the last day, and shall act uprightly; they shall have their reward with their God, neither shall they fear, or be sad." Sur. ii. § 61.

[3] Maracci, p. 27. In Chardin's time the number of pilgrims who visited Mecca every year was estimated at 900,000. Voyage en Perse, tom. iv. p. 168. Warner pretended that the Koreish had abstained from idolatry from the time of Abraham to that of Muhammed, and that they worshipped one God. Vertot, discours sur l'Alcoran, in his Histoire des Chevaliers de Malte, tom. 2. p. 557.

[4] Koran, Sur. ii. § 126; iii. § 96.

established Mecca to be an inviolable sanctuary and asylum;[1] in the time of Adam the spot was occupied by a tent sent down from heaven to serve as a place for man to render worship to his Creator, and to solicit the forgiveness of his sins, and the holy tent was often visited by Adam and Seth, till the latter built over it a temple of stone for the use of his posterity; this temple having been overthrown by the deluge, was rebuilt by Abraham and his son Ismael.[2] The Arabians had been long famed among profane and ecclesiastical writers for the worship of a stone;[3] it was this stone, placed in the most holy spot of the Kaaba, that attracted the homage of so many thousands; Muhammed encouraged the continuance of the same adoration, and declared that this holy stone came out of paradise, and was brought from heaven by Gabriel, who gave it to Abraham; the Christians, with more truth, declared it to be an

[1] Gagnier, tom. ii. p. 136.

[2] Herbelot, v. *Caaba.* The temple of the Kaaba is evidently referred to by Diodorus Siculus, who says that between the country of the Thamudites and the Sabæans ἱερον αγιωτατον ἱδρυται τιμωμενον ὑπο παντων Αραβων περιττοτερον. lib. iii. p. 2.

[3] Αραβιοι σεβουσι μεν, οντινα δε ουκ οιδα· το δε αγαλμα ὁ ειδον, λιθος ην τετραγωνος. Max. Tyr. Dissert. viii. § 8. Παλαι μεν οἱ Σκυθαι, την ακινακην· οἱ Αραβες, τον λιθον· οἱ Περσαι, τον ποταμον προσεκυνουν. Clem. Alex. Protrept. p. 29. Arnobius calls it *informem lapidem*, lib. vi. Suidas describes the Arabian deity—το δε αγαλμα λιθος εστι μελας, τετραγωνος, ατυπωτος, ὑψος ποδων δ' ευρυς δυο, ανακειται δε επι βασεως χρυσηλατου. Suidas in Θευσαρης.

ancient idol, the personification of Venus ;[5] the same charge was alleged by the Carmathians, who carried it away among the plunder of Mecca during the khalifate of Mocktader,[6] and it has been again renewed by the Wahabites of the present day.[7] Thus the religion of Muhammed was established without altering the form of that which had preceded it, the worship of the Pagan Arabs was permitted to proceed in its usual course, the Koreish were still allowed the possession of the house of God, and continued to reap the same profit as usual from the devotees who came to visit the Kaaba, and drink of the sacred well of Zemzem, to which their devotion was increased by

[5] Διοτι επανω αυτουσιασε τῃ Αγαρ ὁ Αβραμ· αλλοι δε, ὁτι προσεδησεν αυτῳ την καμηλον, μελλων θυσαι τον Ισαακ.—ὁ δε ῥηθεις λιθος, κεφαλη της Αφροδιτης εστιν, ἡν παλαι προσεκυνουν οἱ Ισμαηλιται.—φερει γαρ μεχρι και νυν τοις ακριβως κατασκοπουσιν εκ γλυφιδος αποτυπωσιν κεφαλης. Euthymius Zingabenus, p. 14, ed. Sylburg.

[6] Les Carmathes, après avoir pillé la Mecque sous le khalifat de Moctader, enleverent cette pièrre, qu'ils disaient, avec assez de vraisemblance, être un ancien idole : on voulut leur donner cinq mille dinars d'or pour la racheter : mais ils les refuserent, et la retinrent pendant 22 ans, à sçavoir, depuis l'an 317 de l'Hegire, jusqu' au 339, qu'ils la rapporterent à Coufah, sous le khalifat de Mothî. D'Herbelot in *Hagiar Alassouad.*

[7] "The Wahabees have asserted that the veneration paid to the black stone was idolatrous ; and disapproved of the ceremonies practised by the pilgrims at the stone of Abraham, which is placed near the well of Zemzem, and supposed to have on it the mark of the patriarch's foot, formed while he stood there to build the Caaba." Lord Valentia's Travels, vol. ii. p. 389.

the assurance that it was the identical spring which had been produced by God to allay the thirst of Hagar and Ismael.[1] The memory of those who had constructed the fiery pits into which were thrown the Christians of Nadjran, was marked with detestation,[2] but the recent glory of his tribe was sanctified by divine revelation, and it was declared that God himself, by his miraculous interposition, had punished the impiety of Abrahah, who had dared to violate the sanctity of a place which had been made holy by the presence of the patriarchs.[3] The new religion was suited to the inclinations of those for whom it was made, for it allowed and even encouraged their predatory habits, and flattered their lusts.[4]

[1] بير زمزم *puteus Zemzem.* Dicitur hic a Deo productus, ut Hagar et Ismael sitim suam levarent. Reland de Relig. Moham. p. 121.

[2] "Accursed were the contrivers of the pit of fire supplied with fuel, when they sat round the same, and were witnesses of what they did against the true believers; and they afflicted them for no other reason, but because they believed in the mighty, the glorious God, unto whom belongeth the kingdom of heaven and earth." Koran, Sur. lxxxv.

[3] Sur. xv. p. 501. Sale's Vers.

[4] The Mussulmans boast that at Muhammed's birth, angels were heard in the clouds, singing—Induite illum stola Adam, et sublimitate Noë, et scientia Abraham, et lingua Ismael, et pulchritudine Joseph, et patientia Jacob, et voce David, et *castitate Johannis*, et honorificentia Jesu, et fortitudine Moysi, &c. Maracci, p. 11. When the Arabian ladies complained that Muhammed had not left them a corner of paradise, he readily answered—qu'elles ressusciteraient toutes à l'âge de quinze ans,

At first Muhammed affected to shew great favour towards the Christians. His nurse was an Ethiopian slave,[5] and in his own country, as well as during his stay in Syria, he must have had numerous opportunities of learning the corrupted doctrines of Christianity then professed in those parts, and the characters of their professors. "Tell them," he said to Omar, "that their souls are as our souls, their riches as our riches, and that we rejoice at their prosperity, and grieve for their misfortunes, as we do for our own. He who oppresses a Christian shall have him for an accuser at the day of judgment. He who injures a Christian injures me."[6] He saw with what ease every new sectary obtained a party amongst them, and it was his object to gain one to support himself. He accused them of a blind and improper submission to their monks and priests,[7] whilst he wished to reduce them to a still more blind subjection to himself. He acknowledged the Gospel history, and the books

et avec une beauté parfaite; ce qui consola et réjouit les vielles et les laides. Vertot, Discours sur l'Alcoran. Conf. Hottinger, Hist. Orient, lib. ii. c. 4. The liberty, however, which was allowed in regard to women does not appear to have always been approved—Quatre choses, mon frère, observes a Mahomedan doctor, sont pleines de dangers, évite les avec soin: la faveur des princes, la société des méchans, l'amour du monde, et *le commerce des femmes*. Pend Nameh, in the Fundgruben des Orients, band ii. p. 20.

[5] Her name was Omm Aïman. Abulfed. Vit. Moham. p. 2.

[6] Elmacin, Hist. Saracen. lib. i. p. 11.

[7] Sale, note in Koran, Sur. iii. p. 44. 4to. edit.

of the Old Testament, he even made the history, sanctity, and miracles of Jesus a fundamental part of his belief,[1] and on the conversion of a Jew he was compelled first to acknowledge the Redeemer,[2] and to

[1] The following is an epitome of the Mohammedan history of Christ, given by Leland (de Relig. Moham. p. 42) from the Taarich—"Isa (Jesus—عيسي) was the son of Mary (مريم), who was the daughter of Imram of the children of Israel (بنى اسرائيل): and he was a legate sent from the high God, who sent to him from heaven the book of the Gospel. He was also a lawgiver, and called men to the worship of God: and when the Jews endeavoured to kill him, he was carried away to heaven." See Petri Abbatis Epist. in Bibliander, tom. i. pp. 2, 3. Ρικαρδου ανασκευη της κατα του καταρατου Μαχουμεθ, in the same collection, tom. ii. p. 124, 125. In the tract on the Mohammedan religion, edited by Reland, p. 20, is the following account of the canonical books which were acknowledged to have descended from heaven:—"These books are in number one hundred and four, of which the high God sent ten to Adam, fifty to Seth, thirty to Idrisi (Enoch), ten to Abraham, one to Moses, which is the Pentateuch (التورية—תורה), one to Isa (Jesus), which is the Gospel (الانجيل—ευαγγελεαν), one to David, which is the book of Psalms, and one to Muhammed, which is the Koran." In this enumeration he adopted the opinions of the old Sabians, who pretended to possess the books of Adam, Seth, Enoch and Abraham, of the Jews, and of the Christians. He pretended that in his ascent to heaven he saw Yahia (يحيى. John) and Isa (عيسي Jesus) in the second heaven. Abulfed. Vit. Moham. p. 35.

[2] Et si quis Judæus fieri vult Mahumetista, cogitur prius credere Christo: cui talis fuit interrogatio: credisne Christum fuisse flatu dei ex virgine natum, et ultimum prophetam Hebræorum? Quo concesso, fit Mahumetanus. Mart. Alph. Vivaldus, in not. ad Petri de la Cevalleria, Zelum Christi.

believe in his miraculous birth. But he said they had lost or altered the true Gospel, and accused them of having corrupted its doctrines by their dissensions and divisions.[3] He told them that he was come direct from God for the purpose of composing their dissensions, and to lead them in the right way, that he had existed before the existence of the world, which was made for him,[4] artfully applying to himself the prophecies of former ages.[5] With these professions, he invited the Christians to join his standard,[6] and declared his willingness to embrace

[3] Koran, Sur. v. p. 84. Sale.

[4] Chardin, tom. iv. pp. 34, 35.—"L'illustre apôtre des croyans est le prince du monde présent et du monde futur, il est le sceau des envoyés du Trés-Haut, le dernier dans l'ordre des temps, il est la gloire de tous les prophètes qui l'ont précédé. Pend-Nameh, translated in the Fundgruben des Orients, band ii. p. 15. "Comment a-t-il pu éprouver le besoin de quelqu'-une des créatures, ce Prophète pour qui seul l'univers a été tiré do néant, Mohammed, le maître de l'un et de l'autre mondo, dos génies et des hommes, des Arabes et des Barbares!" Arab poet cited by the translator.

[5] Maracci, Prodrom. p. 15. The Muhammedans said that there was a passage in the Testament, where *ειποντος τουτο του Χριστου τοις Ιουδαιοις, ὁτι ευαγγελιζομαι ὑμιν, ἱνα γινωσκητε, ὁτι μετ' εμε μελλει ελθειν ὁ αποστολος και προφητης: το αυτο εστι γεγραμμενον και εν τῳ του Μωσεως παλαιῳ*—but that the Christians had erased these passages from all the copies out of envy. Johan. Catacuzen, *κατα του Μωαμεθ, απολογια τεταρτη*, p. 55. ed. Basil. See d'Herbelot, Bibliothèque Orient. in *Mohammed.* p. 650.

[6] Koran, Sur. v. § 15. Sur. lxi.

them. The wild professions and doctrines of Manes and Mazdak had found numbers to embrace them, and they were less rational even than those of Muhammed.

The Jews were, perhaps, least inclined to embrace the proposals of the impostor, yet his followers were allied to them by similarity of customs and traditions; and, when they were included amongst the number of those who were invited to repentance, many, believing Muhammed to be the promised Messiah, were induced to join him.[1]

[1] Anastasius, Hist. Eccl. p. 103; Theophanes, p. 276; Enustinus in Geneolog. Mahom. p. 10; and Abbas Urspergensis in Chronico, p. 150, ap. Bayle, art. Moham. [CC.]

SECTION XIV.

THE invasion and conquest of Hamyar by the Persians, afforded a pretext for continuing the wars between the king and the Romans; the latter complained of the hostility of the Persians towards their ally the king of Ethiopia, and the Persians easily found causes for complaints in return.[2] In the beginning of the reign of Maurice this war was not ended,[3] and the Saracens still attended the Roman army for the purpose of reconnoitring the enemy, and making incursions into his territories;[4] but they began to be the subject of great distrust, on account of their inconstancy and faithlessness.[5] A continued peace lasted during the reign of Khosroës Parviz, who, on the usurpation of Baharam, had been escorted through the desert by the Arab chiefs[6] to the territory of Rome, and had recovered the throne of his ancestors by the assistance of

[2] Theophylact. Symocatta, Hist. lib. iii. c. 9.

[3] Theophylact. lib. i. cc. 9, 12, 13, et seq. lib. ii. c. 1, &c.

[4] Id. lib. ii. c. 10.

[5] *Απιστοτατον γαρ και αλλοπροσαλλον το Σαρακηνικον φυλον καθεστηκε, παγιον τε τον νουν και την γνωμην προς το σωφρον ιδρυμεχην ουκ εχον.* Theophylact. lib. iii. c. 17.

[6] Nikbi ben Massoud, in the Notices et Extraits de la Bibliothèque du Roi, tom. ii. p. 354, et seq.

Maurice,[1] although the friendly understanding between the two empires had been nearly broken by the predatory incursions of the Roman Arabs into the territory of Babylon.[2] Hostilities, however, commenced after the death of Maurice, and in the Persian war, which lasted from this period till the victories of Heraclius, the Roman and Persian Saracens make again a considerable figure. [3]

Till after the conquest of Mecca, the progress of Muhammed had been unobserved by, perhaps unknown to, the great powers around. The victorious army of Noushirwan was overrunning the richest tracts of Syria, and was only separated from the capital of the Cæsars by the breadth of the Hellespont; but the coffers of Persia were emptied and its best blood wasted in a continuance of desperate efforts, and it would require no very prophetic spirit to foresee that their conquests must soon be abandoned.

After having at Mecca given a death-blow to the

[1] Theophylact. lib. iii. cc. 6—18. lib. iv. cc. 1—16. lib. v. cc. 1—15. gives the history of Persia during the reign of Maurice; as also Evagrius, lib. vi. c. 16.

[2] Theophylact. lib. viii. c. 1.

[3] George of Pisidia mentions the hostile Arabians in Heraclius' expedition:—

Παρην τις αρχιφυλος ευτολμου γενους,
Το Σαρακηνων ταγμα των πολυτριχων
Αγων συν αυτῳ, και περισκυπων, οπως
Λαθων επελθοι τῳ στρατῳ σου προς βλαβην.
De Expedit. Heracl. Acroas. ii. v. 217.

power of his idolatrous opponents, Muhammed began to make advances towards the subversion of Christianity. The chief of the Taiites was a Christian named Adi; his subjects, we are told, were idolaters, and he was obliged to seek refuge in Syria from the arms of the prophet; but his wife and family fell into the hands of the victor, and he was compelled to redeem them by his apostacy.[4] The Christian inhabitants of Dûmato'l-Gjaudal, a town on the frontiers of Syria, five days from Damascus, and fifteen or sixteen from Medina,[5] were induced by the persuasions of Abdo'l-Rahman to accept the faith of Islam, and the daughter of their prince, who was a Calbite and named Ashas, was betrothed to their converter.[6] But their conversion was perhaps insincere, for after the battle of Muta Muhammed was obliged to confirm them by force in their new religion;[7] and at the same time the church of the tribe of Ganam, whose crime, according to the Arabian writers, was that of hypocrisy, was levelled with the ground.[8] But the conquests of Muhammed only extended as yet over the northern districts of Arabia, while the whole of Yaman was subject to Badhân, the Persian viceroy.

[4] Gagnier, Vie de Mahom. tom. ii. p. 211.

[5] Soad al Yemenista, ap. Gagn. not. in Abulfed. p. 125. Al Edrisi makes it four stations from Timal.

[6] Gagnier, tom. i. pp. 431, 432.

[7] Gagnier, tom. ii. p. 225. Abulfeda de Vit. Moham. p. 125.

[8] Gagnier, tom. ii. p. 229.

From Medina Muhammed had directed letters to the sovereigns of the various kingdoms around, to invite them to embrace the new religion, and among the rest to the king of Persia.[1] The Khosroës treated his proposals with contempt, and dispatched an order to the governor of Hamyar to send him either the head or the body of the impostor. But Muhammed was safe amongst his followers from the distant threats of his enemies; Badhân, perhaps, was little inclined to perform the commands of his master, and the dominions of the great king were devoted to future division and destruction by the malediction of the prophet.[2] The latter part of the reign of Khosroës Parviz was clouded by his crimes and his imprudence; he became hateful to his subjects; they revolted against him, confined him in a subterraneous apartment where he had kept his treasures, and raised his son Shoruïa or Siroës to the throne, who commenced his reign by the murder of his father.[3] Muhammed, who had been early informed of this event by his emissaries, before it could have reached the peninsula, pretended to have received the news by supernatural means the same moment in which it occurred, and immediately sent an account of it to the governor of Yaman, who, con-

[1] Gagnier, tom. ii. p. 30. Abulfed. p. 97.

[2] Gagnier, ibid.

[3] Mirkhond, ap. Gagn. p. 32. Nikbi ben Massoud, in the Notices et Extraits de la Bibl. du Roi, gives the history of the death of Parviz and his successors, tom. ii. pp. 358—364.

vinced by this pretended miracle, perhaps before determined in his mind, deserted the service of Persia, accepted the proffered grace, and became the convert and subject of the ruler of Mecca, and brought with him the greater part of the people of Yaman.[4] The power of the prophet was increased by the conversion of the mondar of Hirah, who also deserted the Khosroës, and afterwards distinguished himself by his bravery in the cause of Islam against the Persians. About the same time he was joined, though reluctantly, by Howadah ibn Ali, the Christian king of Yemama.[5]

The dissensions among the Christians greatly assisted the designs of their enemies. The greater part of the Arabs had been separated from the Roman interest by the persecution of their Monophysite pastors. The faith of Heraclius leaned towards his Jacobite subjects, and he was accused of being a Monothelite,[6] and of having drawn upon himself the judgment of heaven for his heretical opinions;[7] yet most of them preferred seeking protection from the new power which had risen in Arabia, to being

[4] Gagn. p. 34. Abulfeda, pp. 93, 94.

[5] Abulfeda, pp. 96, 97.

[6] Zonaras, p. 85. tom. ii. Paris ed.

[7] Per id tempus Cyrus Alexandrinus episcopus et Sergius Constantinopolitanus patriarcha Monothelitarum hæresin prædicabant, &c. Unde divino judicio Agareni, qui et Saraceni dicuntur, Hummaro duce, cœperunt lacerare. Chronica Saracenorum, in Bibliander, tom. ii. p. 1.

exposed to the implacable resentment of their enemies, under the precarious protection of the court of Byzantium. In Egypt the two parties were powerful; the Melchites[1] possessed the capital, and the Copts, or Egyptian Jacobites, waged a continual but useless war from the cloisters of the Thebaid. Muhammed was perhaps well aware of the state of affairs in Egypt; at least, his invitation was directed to the Coptic primate, and not to the orthodox ruler of Alexandria. If the Egyptian Christians were unwilling to change their faith, they were not unwilling to change masters, and they expected to profit by the change. The messenger of the prophet was honourably entertained, and returned with four valuable gems, two virgins, of whom one named Mary was the mother of his son Ibrahim, a mule named Daldal, and an ass whose name was Ya'fur, as presents to his master.[2] Muhammed well knew the

[1] From continual usage the name of Melchites seems to have been applied to all who were of the party of the emperor, and a principle of the Jacobite faith seems to have been indiscriminate opposition. The difference in religious opinions between the two sects appears to have become very trifling, and to have consisted chiefly in terms and modes of expression. Amongst the principal charges against them urged by the Nestorians were, that their priests approached the altar barefooted—that they did not always receive the communion fasting—that they had many pictures in their churches—and, which was worst of all, that they placed pictures of Christ and the Virgin in their baths and other unclean places. Asseman, Bibl. Orient. tom. iii. p. 305.

[2] Abulfeda, Vit. Muham. p. 97. Gagnier, tom. ii. p. 37.

importance of this alliance; and, as he might already contemplate the future conquest of Egypt, the Copts were allowed to continue in their faith; they purchased the protection of the Arabians by a trifling tribute,[3] and the prophet was heard to express his benevolent regard for the Copts of Egypt.[4]

The Monophysites of Arabia and Syria were no less ready to change their masters than the Copts. Many of them sought refuge from their Catholic persecutors in the camp of the Moslem, and their bishops and priests went to negotiate an alliance and a tribute.[5] Seid, the Christian prince of Nadjran, with the patriarch Jesujabus, procured by their valuable gifts a favourable audience of Muhammed himself; they demanded a written document of alliance between the Christians and the Arabs who had embraced the predatory faith of Islam, and the diploma of the prophet stipulated that his subjects should defend them from their enemies; that they should never be compelled to go to fight, or to change their religion; that their priests should be free of tribute, and that that of the laity should be confined within moderate bounds;[6] that the Christians should

[3] Gagnier and Abulfeda, ibid. Makrizi, Hist. Copt. p. 89.

[4] Dixit quoque: Benefacite Coptitis Ægypti: sunt enim vobis genere et affinitate juncti. Elmacin. Hist. Sarac. p. 11. Christiano Coptitæ qui nocet, mihi nocet. Abudacnus, Hist. Copt. præfat.

[5] Asseman. tom. i. p. 494.

[6] A laicis vero pauperibus nummos quatuor, a divitibus nummos duodecim dumtaxat.

be allowed to repair their churches, and that Christian slaves might serve among the Arabians without changing their faith.[1] Similar diplomas are said to have been granted by some of the earlier khalifs to different societies of Christians, perhaps under the guidance of a similar policy.[2] The influence of these lenient measures was quickly perceived in the Roman territories. A lieutenant of Syria is recorded to have deserted the service of Heraclius for the religion of the Koran.[3] The invitation of Muhammed to the king of Ghassan, Hareth ibn Abu-Shamar, had been treated with coldness and neglect,[4] but a similar message to Gabala, the last of the Syro-Arabian princes, who was residing at Tadmor, was followed by his conversion, and he continued a strict Mussulman till the khalifate of Omar, when he was accused of resenting with violence an insult which he had received from a Fazarite, whilst he was religiously performing the circuit of the Kaaba. The affair was brought before the khalif, the Arab bore the marks of his injuries, and the offender was condemned to punishment according to the laws of *talion*,[5] or publicly to beg the pardon of the man

[1] Asseman. tom. ii. p. 418. Maraçci, Vit, Moham. p. 28. An Arabic tract is still extant, bearing the title of a copy of this diploma, and has been published in several editions, but its authenticity has been much disputed.

[2] Asseman. tom. iii. pars 2. p. xcv.

[3] Gagnier, tom. ii. p. 252.

[4] Abulfed. p. 96. Gagn. p. 41.

[5] Millius, de Mohammedismo ante Mohammed, p. 9, has

whom he had injured. The king of Ghassan was unwilling to submit to either; he fled to Constantinople, again turned Christian, and remained so to the end of his days. "May God," says the Moslem historian, "preserve us from so great a misfortune, and from a crime so enormous."[6]

The Arabians boast that the embassy of Muhammed was received with favour by Heraclius, who was then at Emessa, or Hems, on his return from his Persian expedition; they even assert that in secret he had embraced the faith of the prophet.[7] The Christian writers assure us that the emperor was personally visited by Muhammed, and that he granted him a district of land on the borders of Syria.[8] This parade of his peaceful intentions was not, however, long kept up. The murder of the Muhammedan ambassador to the governor of Bostra by Sherheil al Mutar, a Christian chief of the district of Balka, afforded a plausible pretext for hostilities. Three thousand Moslems invaded the Syrian territories of Rome to revenge the insult, and ad-

shewn that Muhammed transmitted to his posterity the same identical laws and modes of administration of justice as were in use among the pagan Arabs. See also the authorities he cites. The *lex talionis* is one instance.

[6] Al Jannabi, ap. Gagnier, tom. ii. p. 71. Rasmussen, Hist. Præcep. Arab. Regn. p. 46. Eichhorn, Monument. Antiq. Arab. p. 170.

[7] Gagnier, pp. 34, 36.

[8] Euthymius, p. 552 (in the Bib. Vet. Patr.). Zonaras, tom. ii. p. 86.

vanced to Muta, in the domain of Balka; the Roman army which opposed them was composed chiefly of Arabs.[1] The battle of Muta was obstinately disputed, and three of Muhammed's favourite generals fell, but the faithful believers were led back in safety to Yatreb, by Khaled, the future conqueror of Syria.[2] The hostile intentions of Muhammed towards the Greeks were now no longer disguised; it was reported that the emperor was preparing to stop the career of the impostor, and the latter, immediately after the conquest of Mecca, publicly declared war against the empire of *Roum*, and collected an army for the invasion of Syria. He proceeded as far as Tabuc, on the road to Damascus, but the perils of the expedition and the discontent of his followers obliged him to retreat, and he declared himself satisfied of the peaceable intentions of his enemies.[3] But the failure of his Syrian expedition was compensated by the reduction of the territory on the Euphrates, and the kingdom of Hirah fell finally beneath the sword of Khaled Ebno'l Walid.[4] The impostor was now less scrupulous towards the Christians; another revelation urged the making war on

[1] Abulfeda, p. 101.

[2] Abulfeda, p. 100. Gagnier, tom. ii. pp. 327, 431. The Greek writers who mention the battle of Muta, call the castle he went against Μουχεων, the battle that of Μοθους. Theophanes, Chronograph. p. 278.

[3] Abulfeda, p. 123.

[4] Pococke, Spec. Hist. Arab. p. 75. Theophanes, p. 279.

all unbelievers, and, though his projects were frustrated by his death, his last command was the invasion of Syria, and the revenge of his generals who fell at Muta.[4] The Syrian provinces had been but lately ravaged by the arms of the Persians, and were in no condition to make a powerful resistance.[5] Within a few years after the death of the prophet, the crescent had spread its baleful influence over Syria, Mesopotamia, Persia, and Egypt.

With the death of Muhammed the last sparks of Christianity in Arabia were extinguished. The professions of Abubeker, were marked by a spirit of moderation,[6] but he was surrounded by men whose only virtues were ferocious bravery and an unrelenting hatred to the enemies of their religion. The treatment of the conquered infidels accorded but

Gagnier, tom. ii. p. 27. The Greek account of the war which followed, may be consulted in Theophanes, &c. The Arabian account, in Elmacin.

[5] Cooperabant sane ad eorum propositum, quod paucis ante annis prædictus Cosdroe eandem Syriam violenter ingressus, urbes dejecerat, vel incenderat, suburbanasque ecclesias subvertens, populum captivaverat: et urbe sancta effracta, hostiliter in ea triginta sex civium millia gladio perimens, crucem dominicam, et loci ejusdem episcopum Zachariam, cum residuo populi tam urbis quam regionis universæ secum transtulit in Persidem. ..... Ingressi igitur Arabes, terram habitatoribus reperientes vacuam, majorem subjiciendi eam sibi repererunt opportunitatem. Gulielmus Tyrius, lib. i. c. 2. Basil. ed.

[6] See the instructions of Abubeker to his generals as given by Gibbon.

little with those which, from such professions, we might be led to expect. The Christians of Jerusalem were subjected to a heavy tribute, and to such galling conditions as were calculated to give a tolerable foretaste of what might follow.[1] The treat-

[1] The following are the conditions of the capture of Jerusalem by Omar. "That the Christians should build no new churches, either in the city or the adjacent territory, either by night or day. That they should set open the doors of them to all passengers and travellers. If any Mussulman should be upon a journey, they should be obliged to entertain him gratis the space of three days. That they should not teach their children the Alcoran, nor talk openly of their religion, nor persuade any one to be of it: neither should they hinder any of their relations from becoming Mahometans, if they had an inclination to it. That they should pay respect to the Mussulmans, and rise up to them if they have a mind to sit down. That they should not go like the Mussulmans in their dress; nor wear such caps, shoes, nor turbants, nor part their hair as they do, nor speak after the same manner, nor be called by the same names used by the Mussulmans. Neither should they ride upon saddles, nor bear any sort of arms, nor use the Arabic tongue in the inscriptions of their seals; nor sell any wine. That they should be obliged to keep to the same sort of habit wheresoever they went, and always wear girdles upon their waists. That they should set no crosses upon their churches, nor shew their crosses nor their books openly in the streets of the Mussulmans. That they should not ring, but only toll their bells. Nor take any servant that had once belonged to the Mussulmans. Neither should they overlook them in their houses. Some say, that Omar commanded the inhabitants of Jerusalem to have the fore parts of their heads shaven, and obliged them to ride upon the pannels sideways, and not like the Mussulmans." Ockley, Hist. of the Saracens, vol. i. p. 257.

ment of the Christians of Egypt was not less rigorous.[2]

Whether any Christians were left in the peninsula of Arabia at the death of Muhammed may be reasonably doubted. His dying injunction was that his native country might be inhabited solely by believers, and it was rigorously enforced in the khalifate of Omar, who is said to have banished from Arabia the Jews who were left at Chaibar.[3] Yet we read of a bishop of Yaman and Sanaa in Arabia, who must have flourished during the eighth century,[4] and of a priest of Yaman at the commencement of the tenth.[5]

Empires and kingdoms, like men, have their diseases and failings, their periods of health, of decline, and recovery; and the page of history is intended to expose their vices, and by comparison to shew their remedies. If the fall of empires is de-

[2] For the persecution of the Christians in Egypt, see Takyeddin Makrizi, in Sacy's Chrestomath. Arabe. On the barbarous conduct of the Moslem towards the Christians in Spain, &c. see the authors in the twelfth vol. of the Bibliotheca Vet. Patrum.

[3] Elmacin, p. 9. Gagnier, tom. ii. p. 285.

[4] Petrus ejusdem discipulus, quum ego Mar Abrahæ a secretis essem, adhuc superstes, Jamanæ et Sanaa in Arabia episcopatum obtinebat. Thomæ Hist. Monast. ap. Asseman, tom. iii. p. 488. Thomas flourished at the beginning of the ninth century. According to Asseman, Timotheus, who ordained Peter, was bishop of Seleucia from 714 to 728.

[5] Johannes V. Isæ filius an. 901 ad Hasanum Jamanæ presbyterum epistolam dedit, &c. Asseman, tom. iii. p. 249.

termined and hastened by an over-ruling Providence, it is when their diseases are become incurable, and consequently when the only mode of permanently bettering mankind must be by their entire destruction. The infidel will boast exultingly that Christianity brought on the world the barbarism, ignorance, and intolerance which marked the latter days of the empire of Rome, and that the religion of Islam is as equally marked by the stamp of miraculous success and divine authority as that of Christ. But his boasting rests on the misrepresentation of what he is himself either unable or unwilling to understand. The spirit of Christianity was a spirit of peace, not of barbarism but of civilization. Ignorance was produced by war and conquest. With the rise of the Roman power, the fate of literature was decided, although various causes delayed for a time its final fall. The Romans were a people whose genius was formed for war and not for civilization. When the world was conquered, and none other remained accessible to their arms, they gave themselves up not to literature but to luxury, and their patronage of learning was but a spirit of emulation. Christianity was propagated in peace, but it became in its progress mixed and tainted with the manners and sentiments of the various people who received it. Persecution, perhaps, is one of the surest schools of tyranny and intolerance; the disciples of the Gospel underwent a long and arduous preparation in it, and when at length they obtained possession of the reins of power, we see that it had not been without effect.

A slight concurrence of circumstances ensured the success of Mohammedanism, and a still slighter might have destroyed it at its first appearance. If its progress from obscurity be a proof of its truth, the rise of Rome proved the truth of its idolatry. The empires of Rome and Persia have passed away, the power of the Saracens has fallen before the same causes, and that which succeeded it is quickly following, but Christianity has arisen superior to every obstacle, and is now spread over countries unknown to Christians of former days. The name of Hamyar has sunk into oblivion, but the native songs of Ethiopia still celebrate the memory of Elesbaan the conqueror of Yaman, and of Arethas the pious martyr of Nadjran.[1]

1 See Ludolf, Hist. Æthiop. lib. ii. c. 4.

APPENDIX.

(A) *referred to at page* 13.

History of the tribes of Tasm and Hodaisah, from Ecchelensis, Hist. Orient. c. 1.

"Aliæ duæ Tasmitarum et Hodaisitarum numero et potentia non minus celebres erant. Illi nomen et originem a Tasmo filio Ludi, filii Aram, filii Sem, filii Noë. Utrisque ex Tasmitarum gente dudum regnarunt reges usque ad Amlukum, sub quo simultatibus et bellis extincti sunt. Causa tantorum malorum ab authoribus ita narratur. Dederat Masecus nobilis vir ex Hodaisitarum genere uxori nomine Hozaitæ repudii libellum, quæ a domo illius egressa, unicum quem ab ipso susceperat filium secum abduxit: maritus ille invita et reluctante eum reducere conabatur. Res tandem ad Amlukum regem delata est, qui, cum eos minime conciliare potuisset, puerum neutri parentum tradendum pronunciavit, sed suorum servorum albo adscribendum accensendumque esse. Mater amissi nati dolore vix consolabili commotus, his versibus, quos, ubi gentium reperiebatur, accinebat, regis judicium et iniquitatem carpebat atque discindebat:—

Regi adfuimus Tasmitarum, ut æquum,
At pro nefas! tyrannide justitiam commutans Hozaitam delusit:
Sed quod æquum judicium reddere valet, qui judicio caret?
Sapientia qui penitus est destitutus, insipienter semper agit.
Ah mater incipiens! ab insipiente sapientiam quæris?
Ah imprudens mater! nullus nunc pœnitendi relinquitur locus.

Hæc percipiens rex maximo percitus est furore et ira, statimque lata lege sanxit, ut nulla puella ex Hodaisitis ad maritum

deduceretur, antequam ab illo deflorata fuerit. Salacissimi regis hæc lex perduravit, et executioni mandata est, usque ad Sciamusæ cognomento Hofairæ filiæ Habadi Hodaisitarum nobilissimi matrimonium, quæ suæ ætatis puellarum formosissima erat. Hæc namque, cum ad Amlukum regem deduceretur suorum constipata turba, nullumque evadendi videret locum, suas ita deplorabat vices.

Heu! trahor ad improbum meis etiam deducentibus,
Nec miseræ virgini ullus evadendi relinquitur locus?

Cumque sequente die dimissa fuerit proprio sanguine turpissimum in modum inquinata, suorum ignaviam ignominiamque simul his versibus exagitare cœpit.

Hodaisitis quis vilior in toto reperitur orbe?
Ita cum vestra virgine, o viri, coram etiam agitur?
Quis, præter vos, ingenuus æquo animo id patitur?
Unus dotem dat, alius eorum carpit florem?
Nonne præstat ejusmodi viro millies oppetere mortem,
Quam suam tam improbo prostituere sponsam?

Quæ, cum suos stimulo honoris incitari et concitari animadvertisset, hos alios addit versus provocans eos ad vindictam sumendam de tam sceleratissimo tyranno.

Ad prostibulum vestras trahi patimini virgines,
Cum viri sitis, et quidem ingenui, ac innumeri?
Proh nefas! Hofaira suo ita turpiter sanguine innatat?
Sane, si viri essemus, vos vero colis, fusisque armati,
Nequaquam tantum ferremus, ut vos, æquo animo flagitium.
Quare pro honore aut oppetite mortem, aut perimite hostem,
Ignemque belli stimuli honoris accendite lignis;
Sin minus, patriæ vale dicitote, loca deserta petentes,
Ibique supremum cum gloria, viri, agite diem.

Quæ audiens Alasuad ejus pater, qui maximæ authoritatis inter Hodaisitas erat, supra quam dici potest indignatur stimuloque pungitur honoris, et Hodaisitarum collectis ducibus ait: Quousque fortissimi virorum tanta torpebimus ignavia? Quousque

Arabum nobilissimi tantam ignominiæ feremus notam? Agite, agite igitur, arma capiamus, ac pro tot tamque horrendis sceleribus sumamus tandem vindictam, et sanguine ipso peractam abluamus maculam: luat salacissimus demum promeritam suorum criminum pœnam. His dictis auditisque, somnum, qui tam alto profundoque illorum corda et animos occupaverat, excutiunt duces, et hortanti respondent: Tuis jussibus obsequi, et sequi exemplum, præsto sumus omnes: at numero, potentia, et armorum supellectile Tasmitis longissime sumus impares, ut nec te fugit. Quibus ille: Ingenio numerus, potentia, et armorum supellex supplendæ sunt; sequimini mea consilia, victoria certa erit. Cui, age, inquiunt. Cum itaque omnium vota sibi obstrinxisset, et firmasset præstito juramento, sequente die tanquam sororis nuptias celebraturus, maximum regi ac Tasmitis instruxit convivium in amplissima quadam planitie, in qua Hodaisitæ ex ejus jussu sub arma sua absconderunt arma, ad quod rex libenter ac lætissimus properat, Hofairæ adhuc captus incensusque amore. Frater autem ejus Alasuad, ubi hostes vino madidos et obrutos videt, suis dat signum, qui statim captis armis improviso in hostem inermem, et nihil tale suspicantem, irruunt, et omnes ad ultimum pene trucidarunt. Unus ex tanta clade illius familiæ evasit Raba filius Maræ, qui ad Hasanum Arabiæ-felicis regem confugiens auxilia ab illo obtinuit, demumque post multa commissa prælia cecidit ipse Raba, et Hodaisitæ extincti sunt ad ultimum, quibuscum utriusque gentis deletum est genus, unde *Baieditæ* aliis Arabibus dicti sunt, nempe deleti et extincti."

(B) *referred to at page* 39.

Arabian accounts of the origin of Dzu Nowass' enmity to the Christians, from d'Herbelot, Bibliothèque Orientale.

"Abu-Nauàs. Il regnoit dans l'Iemen ou Arabie heureuse, avant le temps de Mahomet, et etoit grand ennemi des Crêtiens, dont le nombre s'étoit fort multiplié dans ses états. Houssain-

Vaez sur le chapitre 85 de l'Alcoran intitulé *Sourat-al-bourouge*, des signes du Zodiaque, où il est parlé des Ashab-al-okhdoud, c'est-a-dire de ceux qui avoient preparé des fosses pleines de feu, rapporte l'histoire suivante, qui est fort avantageuse aux Chrêtiens. Il dit donc qu' Abou-Nauàs, roi idolâtre, et fort adonné à la magie, avoit auprès de lui un celebre magicien, que l'on regardoit comme son premier ministre, et lequelle en cette qualité gouvernait avec une authorité presque absoluë ses etats. Cet homme se voyant fort avancé en âge, dit au roi que le grand nombre de ses années le rendant de jour à autre moins propre à son service, il le prioit de lui donner quelque jeune homme bien né, et qui fût capable d'apprendre tout ce qu'il lui enseigneroit touchant son art, afin qu' après l'avoir bien instruit, il pût lui rendre après sa mort les mêmes services qu'il avait tâché de lui rendre pendant sa vie. Le roi agrea cette proposition, et lui donna un de ses propres enfans à instruire. Le jeune prince doüé de beaucoup d'esprit, profitait tous les jours de plus en plus en l'école de ce vieillard, et allait de tems en tems à la campagne pour y pratiquer ce que son maître lui avait appris. Un jour qu'il s'étoit un peu écarté du chemin, il trouva dans un lieu fort retiré un hermite Chretien, auquel il demanda quelle étoit la forme de vie qu'il menait dans ce desert. Cet hermite en satisfaisant sa curiosité sur ce point, prit occasion de l'instruire de la connoisance du vrai Dieu qu'il servait, et de l'aveuglement de ceux qui n'adorant que des idoles, ou plûtôt des dêmons, abusaient par leurs enchantements la plus grande partie des Arabes. Le prince prit goût à ce qu'il entendait, et trouva la vie que menait cet Hermite si agreable, qu'il resolut de l'imiter, de se soûmettre à sa conduite, et de se ranger sous son obeïssance, pour être pleinement instruit de la connoissance et du culte du soverain maître dont il lui parloit.

"Il quitta donc son magicien et s'attacha si bien à son nouveau maître, qu'il fit en peu de tems de très-grands progrez dans la vie spirituelle. Dieu l'éclaira de ses plus pures lumières, et le favorisa même du don des miracles qui le desabuserent bien-tôt des faux artifices et des prestiges de la magie. Un jour qu'il

fut obligé de quitter son desert pour aller à la ville, il trouva sur sa route un serpent d'une énorme grosseur, lequelle avoit tellement effrayé tout le pays circonvoisin, qu'aucun n'osait se hasarder de passer par cet endroit : il invoqua aussi tôt le nom de Dieu createur du ciel et de la terre, et armé de la seule confiance qu'il avait en lui, il s'approcha de ce monstre, et lui commanda de quitter ce lieu là, et de retourner dans celui d'où il étoit sorti. Ce monstre obéït promptement, et tous ceux qui furent presens à cette action, admirerent la puissance du Dieu qu'il avait invoqué. Il fit encore la même chose à l'égard d'un lion qui traversait son chemin, car s'approchant de lui il lui mit la main sur le col, et le caressa comme il aurait fait un agneau. Le bruit de ces miracles se répandit en peu de tems dans le pays, et chacun était persuadé que le Dieu qu'il adorait ne refusait rien à ses prieres. En effet un des principaux seigneurs de la cour, qu'avait perdu la vûë, vint à lui pour la recouvrer, et le jeune prince lui dit que s'il voulait suivre la loi qu'il lui enseigneroit, et promettre de lui garder le secret, Dieu par sa toute-puissance lui rendrait infailliblement la vûë. Ce seigneur n'eut pas grand peine à le lui promettre, et il fut incontinent éclairé : mais il alla d'abord se présenter au roi, lequel lui ayant demandé comment il avait recouvré l'usage de la vûë, Dieu tout-puissant, lui répondit-il, me l'a rendu par sa grace. Alors Abou-Nauàs voulut savoir de lui qui était ce Dieu, et il lui repliqua : C'est le seul et unique Dieu qui n'a point de semblable. Abou-Nauàs, qui était fort attaché au culte de ses faux dieux, usa d'artifice pour apprendre de lui qui était le maître de cette nouvelle doctrine, et pour cet effet il lui dit : Je voudrais être instruit, au-si-bien que vous, de cette divinité, pour y croire ; et ce seigneur qui était déja animé d'un grand zele, et désiroit extrémement d'attirer le roi à la connoissance du vrai Dieu, ne manqua pas de le lui découvrir aussi-tôt le docteur qui la lui avait enseignée, et après s'être informé exactement de tous ce qu'il croyait et enseignait aux autres, fit tous ses efforts pour le faire renoncer à cette créance : mais comme il s'apperçut que ni les promesses ni les menaces n'étoient pas

capables d'ébranler sa foi, il commanda qu'on le menât bien avant en haute mer, pour le fair perir ; mais il arriva que ceux qui la conduiserent furent tous submergez, et qu'il se sauva lui-seul.

" Le roi fort irrité commanda derechef qu'on le jettât dans une fosse pleine de feu : mais le feu s'élevant au dessus de la fosse, brûla tous les executeurs de cet sentence injuste, sans que ce jeune Chrêtien en fût endommagé. Ou l'attacha ensuite à un arbe, et on fit décocher contre lui mille traits, dont aucun ne l'offensa ; et ce fut alors que cet invincible martyr dit au roi : Croyez en ce Dieu qui fait paroître tant de prodiges à vos yeux, c'est lui qui à créé toutes choses, et qui en est par consequent le maître absolu: mais le rois s'endurcissant de plus en plus dans son incredulité, lui dit : Je ne veux autre chose, sinon de vous ôter la vie. Le Chrêtien alors lui repartit ; Si vous voulez executer ce dessein, tirez contre moi une fleche en disant ces paroles : *Au nom du Dieu en qui tu crois,* et vou verrez l'effet qu'elle produira. Le roi executa ce qu'il lui dit, et du seul coup il mit à mort ce généreux martyr. Tous ceux qui assisterent à ce combat glorieux firent profession publique de la foi que le martyr leur avait annoncée, et remporterent une victoire signalée contre ce tyran, lequel irrité par leur constance, les fit jettre tous dans des fosses qu'il fit creuser et remplir de feu dans la montagne voisine, et c'est de ces fosses ardentes, ou fournaises, que le nom de Ashab-al-okdoud est demeuré à ces peuples.—*Houssain-Vaez.*

" Il-y-a cependant d'autres historiens qui rapportent differemment l'histoire des fosses pleines de feu dont il est parlé dans l'Alcoran. Ils disent qu'Abou-Nauàs s'etant un jour enyvré, coucha avec sa propre sœur, et qu'aussi-tôt qu'il fut retourné en son premier état, il lui dit : Que ferons-nous pour nous garantir de la honte qui nous couvrira aussi-tôt que ce que c'est passé entre nous sera divulgué ? Sa sœur lui dit : Je ne sçai point de meilleur expedient que celui-ci : Faîtes publier une loi par laquelle il sera permis à chacun d'épouser sa propre sœur ; car après que cette loi aura été reçuë et pratiquée par

vos sujets, on ne s'étonnera point si vous m'épousez ; et lorsque l'on aura oublié ce qui s'est passé, vous en pourrez fair publier une autre qui abolira la première, et vous remettrez ausi les choses au même etat qu'elles sont à present.

" Le roi trouva ce conseil fort bon, et s'en voulut servir : mais aussi-tôt que la loi qui permettoit aux freres et aux sœurs de se marier ensemble eut été publiée, les peuples, et particulierement les Chrêtiens qui étaient pour lors en très-grand nombre dans l'Arabie, s'y opposerent si fortement, que le roi ne peut jamais le fair passer, nonobstant toutes les menaces et toutes les peines qu'il fit souffrir aus desobeïssants. Mais enfin cette resistance si générale alluma sa colere à un telle point, qu'il fit creuser plusieurs puits qu'il remplit de feu où il commanda que l'on jettât tous ceux qui ne se rendaient pas à ses volontés. —*Thiraz al-mankousch.*"

GENERAL INDEX.

	Page
Abdolmotalleb Ibn Hasjemi	98, 152
Abrahah, king of Hamyar	90
Abuboker	185
Abyssinia	40
Abyssinian Christians	126
Achsa, the poet	159
Africa invaded	16
Amru, the poet	140
Arabians called Indians	20
Arabia, geography of	1
Arabian literature, the golden age of	164
Architecture	9
Aryat of Abyssinia, his expedition to Arabia	59
Ascha, the poet	141
Auxuma, city	43
Bab el Mandoub	57
Balkis or Sheba	17
Baradæus, a Syrian monk	125
Bartholomæus, apostle	28
Becrites, an Arab tribe	139
Caab ben Zohair, a bard	159
Caabah, Mecca	23
Cabatanon	10
Cassanitæ	10
China, invaded	20, 21
China, its silk trade	86
Chorasm	19
Christ, controversy about	110
Christ, worship of	54
Cilab, battle of	38
Copts of Egypt	181
Council of Chalcedon	116
Council of Constantinople	113
Cyril of Alexandria	109
Dioscorus, patriarch of Alexandria	112
Dzu Nowass, king	53
Dzu Nowass, history of	192
Egypt	44
Elesbaan, Christian king of Abyssinia	51
Esimiphaeus	61
Ephesus, Council of	114
Ethiopia	40
Eusebius of Dorylaeum	113
Eutyches, a byzant. archimandrite	110
Flavian, primate of Constantinople	112
Frumentius, apostle	20
Gardafui, Cape	58
Ghassan, kings of	67
Gregentius, St., Bishop of Taphar	92
Hamyar, king of	9
Hamyar, of Yaman	15
Hamyarites, religion of	7
Hareth, the warrior	16
Hareth, king of the Arabs	101
Hareth, king of Ghassan	131
Herban, a Jewish Rabbi	92
Hieroglyphics	44
Hirah, kings of	63, 68
Hodais, tribe of	190
Icthyophagi	12
Immortality, believed in	8
Indians, Arabs called so	29
Islamism, its power	158
Jacobite sect	124

	Page
Jacobus Baradæus	125
Jerusalem, capture of	180
Jews in Arabia	92
Jews of Yatreb	23
Justinian, the Roman Emperor	86
Kaaba, temple of Mecca	95
Kahtan	14
Khaled, the warrior	184
Khaulan, district of	10
Khosroës Parviz, king of Persia	178
Kobad, king of Persia	85, 102
Koloë, town	48
Koran, its power	160
Koran, its composition	161
Koreish, tribe of	14, 97, 160
Koreish, their victory over Abrahah	99
Lebid, Arabian poet	107
Leo, the Roman pontiff	114
Maadites	38
Mariaba, city	9, 12
Mary, the holy virgin	111
Mazdak, the prophet	101
Mecca, the pilgrimages to	167
Melchite sect	123
Mesopotamia, invasion of	86
Mena, valley of	93
Minæi, prov. Hedjaz	9
Moallacat, Arabic poems	106
Mondar, Arabian chief	134
Monks, the zeal of Eastern	116
Monophysite sect	119
Muhammed, birth of	152
Muhammed, prophetic career	157
Muhammed and the Christians	171
Naaman, Arabian chief	78
Nabatæi, People of Petra	9
Nadjran, siege of	52
Nestorius, the doctrines of	100
Noman abu Kabus	142
Nonnosus, his embassy to Arabia	87
Noushirwan, king of Persia 105,	148
Ocelis, port of	10
Omar, khalif	187
Omar's laws for the Christians	186
Petra, city of	64
Poetry in Arabia	107
Rei, a town in Persia	104
Saba, city of	12
Sabæa, merchants of	4
Sabota, city of	9
Sanaa, city of	9
Sanaa, Christian church at	95
Saracens, name of	75
Scenite Arabs	66
Seif Dzu Jezen, an Arab chief	147
Severus, a Syrian bishop	121
Shahpoor, king of Persia	69
Shamar, king	18
Shamarchand, city of	19
Simeon Stylites, an Arabian monk	77, 82
Sogd, land of	19
Syria	64
Syria, the Persian invasion of	85
Taglabites, Arabs of Ghassan	138
Taprobana, or Ceylon	47
Tasm, tribe of	190
Theophilus Indus	33
Yaman or Arabia	1
Yaman, its inhabitants	13
Yersoum, king of Himyar	145
Zemzem, holy well of	95
Zenobia	71
Zohair, an Arabian poet	130

G. NORMAN, PRINTER, MAIDEN LANE, COVENT GARDEN.

00055029

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 27 February, 2016